

Duquesne University Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Spring 2011

Organizational Communication Through An Historic Lens: Social Responsibility, Diversity, and Inclusion

Linda Coleman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Coleman, L. (2011). Organizational Communication Through An Historic Lens: Social Responsibility, Diversity, and Inclusion (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/423>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH AN HISTORIC LENS:
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Linda Ann Coleman

May 2011

Copyright by
Linda Ann Coleman

2011

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH AN HISTORIC LENS:
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION

By

Linda Ann Coleman

Approved December 17, 2010

Dr. Pat Arneson
Professor of Communication and
Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Chair)

Dr. Janie Fritz
Professor of Communication and
Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

Dr. Ronald C. Arnett
Professor of Communication and
Rhetorical Studies

Dr. Christopher Duncan
Dean, McAnulty College of Liberal Arts
Duquesne University

ABSTRACT

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH AN HISTORIC LENS: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION

By

Linda Ann Coleman

May 2011

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Pat Arneson

This work examines the development of organizational communication through significant historic periods in the United States. Each chapter is examined in the context of social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion. The work concludes with a case study of the United States Steel Corporation as an example of an historically grounded organization that remained philosophically grounded in their core mission and values as set forth by Elbert Gary, their first president and CEO. Additive change and the need to remain attuned to the historic moment while moving toward the future is explored.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Pat Arneson who worked with me tirelessly and encouraged me to stretch my thinking. She supported me and kept me focused on the process while allowing me to explore and learn. Her support was invaluable. I would like to thank Dr. Ronald C. Arnett and Dr. Janie Fritz who worked with me to accomplish my goals and gave valuable feedback. I would also like to thank Dr. Calvin Troup who counseled me when I began my doctoral work and has been a steadfast supporter. I would like to thank my friends Michael J. Urick and Joe DeCrosta who listened to me many times over lunch.

I would like to dedicate this work to my mother Patricia who always supported my dreams and my father Emil who was a steelworker and introduced me to the wonderful world of libraries. Most especially I would like to thank my family. My husband Ron who has supported and encouraged me through the years as I grew into the person I have become. His boundless help and support enabled me to accomplish this project. I would like to thank my children, Matthew, Rachel and my daughter in law Marnie who supported me and listened to my ideas, and taught me so much about life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
CHAPTER ONE	1
The Importance of the Industrial Revolution in Organizational Communication	3
Leadership Communication in Organizations	6
The Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility, Diversity, and Inclusion in Organizations	8
Corporate Social Responsibility	9
Diversity and Inclusion	13
Summary	17
CHAPTER TWO	19
Scientific Management Theory.....	20
Classical Management Theory.....	24
The Theory of Bureaucracy	27
Corporate Social Responsibility in the Classical Approach	36
Diversity and Inclusion	39
Summary	46
CHAPTER THREE	48
Chester I. Barnard and Peer to Peer Communication	50
Elton Mayo’s Hawthorne Studies	53
Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.....	57

Douglas McGregor's Balance of Work	59
Frederick Herzberg: Integrating.....	62
Charles W. Redding: Creating a Discipline	64
Communication in the Human Relations Approach	66
Corporate Social Responsibility in the Human Relations Approach.....	69
Diversity and Inclusion in the Human Relations Approach	72
Summary	74
CHAPTER FOUR.....	78
The Systems Approach	79
Ludwig von Bertalanffy: Father of Systems	81
Karl E. Weick: Organizational Communication	83
The Work of Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn	85
The Human Resource Management Approach	88
Rensis Likert's Contributions	89
The Work of Leonard Nadler.....	92
The Work of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton	94
Communication in the Systems Approach and Human Resource Management Approach.....	95
Corporate Social Responsibility	100
Diversity and Inclusion	103
Summary	106
CHAPTER FIVE	108
Cultural Approaches	109

Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy's Approaches	111
Edgar H. Schein: Culture	113
Stanley Deetz: Corporate Power	118
Cheris Kramarae: Muted Group Theory	121
Julia T. Wood: Direct Power	123
CHAPTER SIX.....	136
Classical Management in USS.....	143
The Human Relations Approach in USS	149
The System and Human Resources Approach in USS	152
Cultural-Critical Approaches in The United States Steel Corporation.....	157
Communication in USS	158
Corporate Social Responsibility in USS	160
Diversity and Inclusion in USS.....	161
Conclusion	165

CHAPTER ONE

The Value of an Historical Approach to Organizational Communication

Martin Buber posited, “There are three principles in a man’s being and life, the principle of thought, the principle of speech, and the principle of action. The origin of conflict between me and my fellow-men is that I do not say what I mean and I don’t do what I say” (Buber 29). Authentic communication requires a desire to match word with deed. Organizations struggle to foster communication that addresses a diverse and global world in 2010.

This project arose from working with organizations to develop more effective, meaningful ways of communicating. Current organizational schools of thought recognize the need to move communication to a less hierarchical design; however, there is a need to look back to examine the historic progression of management that leads us to present day organizational communication theory. Scholars have an obligation to examine our “intellectual heritage as it is shaped by experiences, reflection and the study of those who have gone before us” (Wren and Bedeian 906). Theoretical precedents influence the understanding and application of organizational communication.

As society has evolved, organizations have also changed. Our world functions in a global economy, which requires organizational members to communicate with varied people of diverse cultures and backgrounds. As organizations become increasingly diverse communication plays an increasingly important role in the sustainability required for success. Warren Bennis argued, “The metaphor of the organization as a machine that creates value for stakeholders is too simplistic, everyone agrees. But what metaphors are

illuminating? I am intrigued by the notion of the organization as a changing responsive organization as a community” (Bennis xv).

This project seeks to gain a better understanding of organizational change through an understanding of historical time periods and the role communication plays in organizational leadership. This chapter will first discuss why an historical perspective on organizational communication is important. Second, leadership communication in organizations and the need for leaders to address issues concerning social responsibility, diversity and inclusion will be discussed. Third, social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion are examined for the impact on organizational communication.

Although organizations develop mission, vision, and value statements, such documents continually require reflection on the historical moment. In response to the organizational challenges presented by the 21st century, an historical lens provides guidance to several of the communication challenges. Organizations encompass social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion when leaders are attentive to social direction and postmodern challenges.

The danger in focusing singularly on the present is the failure to understand contributions of the past. Historical responses cannot fully address our present day concerns. This connection from past to present requires understanding and thoughtful reflection. Most formal organizational protocols were designed with an understanding that these protocols would also improve communication within the organization. Many of the early formal communication processes treated workers as part of the mechanism of production. The notion of human-centered communication developed slowly within organizations; early structures focused on command and control models. While such

models serve an effective purpose in specific industries and within certain boundaries, they fail to move organizational communication closer to a human-centered understanding of social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion.

Martin Buber stated that in daily human interaction the human component is not always the primary focus. Buber argued, “The strategist might be someone climbing the status ladder in an organization. When the climber talks to people; the human being is secondary, and the contact or an influential friend is primary” (25). Buber emphasized that communication used to gain strategy and to manipulate will only serve to make matters worse in organizational conflict. The study of organizational development was conceived to develop communication skills in leaders and managers who would then develop the communication skills of employees, thus educating and improving organizational life.

The Importance of the Industrial Revolution in Organizational Communication

During the early 1900s, research conducted on the internal workings of organizations fell primarily under the realm of psychology or business (Schein 12). Neither of these disciplines examined communication in meeting the changing needs of the organization. Organizations were moving from pure industrial growth powerhouses to more complex entities that fostered community and culture through people (Shockley-Zalabak 56).

Most forms of organizational communication were developed or emerged as a result of social change such as the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution was a time of transformative change in the United States. The United States was a rural nation prior to the Industrial Revolution, which brought about railroads, automobiles, and the

telegraph system (Hillstrom 6). For the first time in history people were given the opportunity to change their destiny and their identity through migration from agricultural work to factory work in urban settings. Apart from its obvious impact on western and world economics, the industrial revolution brought about tremendous social change. One of the most significant changes was the exodus of people migrating to cities where opportunities for employment abounded. This exodus of workers from the rural to the urban world proved challenging. Cities were overcrowded, creating a need to build and develop places for families to live. Children were sent to school rather than workhouses or farms. This social culture, developed over a century, brought about change through hardship and sacrifice. The rural community was also impacted by the changes in the cities caused by industrial growth. Labor was traditionally viewed as working long hours for a minimal pay.

The onset of the Industrial Revolution was perhaps the most significant event in organizational history. The main catalyst for this change was human and culturally driven. Workers were migrating to cities and changing their way of life based upon employment opportunities. Social change was an integral part of organizing. The connection between past and present theories of organizational communication become more obvious when examined through the lens of human-centered culturally based social change. In the mid to late 1800s changes occurred rapidly and the social climate of the world was no longer an incidental by-product of organizations. The economy of the world was impacted by the ability of machines to increase efficiency and production of many labor laden tasks (Coffin, Stacey, Lerner, and Meacham 14).

Organizational structures were altered as a result of social change and organizational communication changed as well.

There were direct and indirect consequences of this change. One consequence was that workers had a safer and more humanistic-based working environment. Men, women, and children, who suffered greatly in coal mines, factories, and other manufacturing sweatshops, were gradually gaining rights to humane treatment and fair wages. Along with these changes emerged child labor laws. These laws were guiding lights to the children who suffered extreme hours of laborious and dangerous work. As these laws came into practice, organizational leaders began to see value in the worker as a skilled person needed to run the new machines that were revolutionizing production (Coffin, Stacey, Lerner, and Meacham 15).

Since the Industrial Revolution organizations have evolved from a reactionary to a pro-actionary state. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, *Status quo* was the *modus operandi* leaving development and change to become a temporary fix rather than a directed effort. Organizational communication history provides an insightful and necessary understanding of how today's practices developed.

Organizations such as hospitals, corporate entities, financial institutions, and retail industries require us to communicate. The length of time to receive a message has greatly diminished since the Industrial Revolution. Organizations no longer rely on antiquated telegraphs. Organizations in 2010 communicate rapidly through emails, text messaging, telephones, including cellular phones, and webinars. Computer technology and the Internet impacted organizational communication and demanded adaptive change.

As scholars of communication we must remain attuned to these changes and protect the exploitation of miscommunication in cases of organizational conflict and deliberate harm. Scholars have a great responsibility to attend to and respect the historic moment.

Leadership Communication in Organizations

Organizational leadership has long been the subject of study for many scholars, including Barnard M. Bass, Bruce J. Aviola, Roger M. Stoghill, and George Yuki. Cognitive functioning research lessened while research on human interaction has increased in leadership and small groups (Hogg). Leaders in organizations set the tone for the communication process. This process may be hierarchical and extremely formal--constrained by rules, and protocols. Leaders of organizations may have a communication format to which employees must adhere, similar to military protocol. Communication is the connective force of human engagement; "communication brings philosophy into human action" (Arnett 77). Leaders engage human action through communication in an organization. The question that arises in leadership literature often addresses why a leader should be the particular one in charge.

Authentic leadership is a term scholars have used to express the need for leaders to match their words with deeds. "Leadership must also involve consistency and coherence within and between the leader's various roles" (Goffee and Jones 13). According to Rob Goffee and Gareth Jones authenticity requires consciousness, coherence, and consistency. Social distance is necessity for authentic leadership. George Simmel, the German sociologist, held that social distance in organizational life holds an ironic sense (Goffee and Jones 14). Leaders need to distance themselves to maintain their

perspective and to view the larger picture of the organization. Leaders must also establish a sense of closeness to reduce the hierarchy of the past in communication practices. Historically as organizations developed and leadership practices changed leaders became responsible for effective communication delivery. Studying leadership communication styles became vital to understanding organizational culture and life (Schein). There is a need to communicate message and mission in a clear and direct manner while minimizing the sense of alienation from leader to mid-level manager to line worker. This requires a delicate balancing of important tasks that may be likened to a dance. Leaders need to understand the means of communication as much as the message conveyed: “skillful leaders ensure that they use the right mode of communication. This requires a fine appreciation of the message, the context, the people you wish to communicate with, as well as your own personal strengths and weakness” (Goffee and Jones 161). Leaders have a responsibility to communicate as authentically as possible.

Business organizations are required by government employment policies Thomas L. Friedman argued, “We need politicians who are able and willing to both explain and inspire” (281). Explanation and inspiration are both executed through communication. Leaders are called to inspire in their organizations. While in the past leaders may have inspired a call to nationalism or war, organizational leaders must inspire a call to mission and commitment to the organization. Communication concerns across time have shifted to include a move toward cooperation within organizations or an *esprit de corps* where workers felt they had a direct stake in the organization’s success. Communication remains the one factor that has the ability to unite, inspire, connect or bring together a group of people working for a common goal (Goffee and Jones 15).

Legislation designed to protect workers within organizations reveal another valid reason for leaders to remain attentive to the historical moment. Leaders who are communicating authentically must be aware societal shifts that over time alter regulations. At the time of the Industrial Revolution workers gained value in their organizations.

The Federal Labor Bureau emerged in 1884 to protect workers from exploitation. As time progressed and workers became more vocal concerning their conditions the Labor Management Act became law in 1959. This prohibited improper activities by labor and management. The laws required leaders to communicate labor information, including disclosure of financial reports to union workers and employees, rights of workers, and information concerning secondary boycotts. Another historical change occurred in 1967 when the Age Discrimination in Employment Act was established. By 1990 the Americans with Disabilities Acts became law which prohibited discrimination due to physical or mental disabilities (Sweet and Meiksins 71). The American Disabilities Act created opportunities for workers who had been previously excluded from many jobs. This also challenged many organizations make accommodations. The progressive laws display some of the reason leaders need to communicate well to address issues such as social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion within an organizational context.

The Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility, Diversity, and Inclusion in Organizations

A call for organizations to be socially responsible emerged from an environmental and fiscal perspective. However, these concerns have been looming in the organizational world for over a century. This section briefly previews the history of social responsibility and the communication challenge it presents for leaders. Social responsibility

encompasses several areas, including the role of diversity and inclusion from an ethical perspective. Leaders have an obligation to communicate on several levels in contemporary organizations. There is an ever increasing demand from the public for organizations to become more socially responsible. This includes attending to environmental issues as well as responding to concerns for financial stability in word and deed. Many developments in contemporary organizations have called into question the ethical practices of those in positions of financial power. Power requires responsibility, which includes the responsibility of addressing social issues. There are also many laws and practices in place which require organizational audits and compliance (Frederick 7). Attentiveness to organizational mission and values is critical in a global world. Communication is the keystone of the organization's success.

Corporate Social Responsibility

This section will address the historical progression of this means of inquiry. Scholars are interested in corporate social responsibility (CSR) for several reasons. Organizations have an impact upon society, which requires ethical organizational practices.

Edward Alsworth Ross was a progressive American sociologist and a prominent figure in criminology. He was a professor at Indiana University from 1891 to 1892. His seminal work *Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter Day Iniquity*. In 1907 Ross became concerned with what he termed "criminaloids" who worked in the field of commerce (Yeager 93). While Ross and Sutherland's research began studying white collar crime, corporate business practices remained *status quo*. Traditionally the focus was on the person as a criminal who practiced these crimes rather than on the organization itself.

Although corporate philanthropy was emerging in the 1920s, corporate social responsibility was not a primary concern for organizations at this time. Moral conduct was not deemed by organizational leaders as their charge. Organizational leaders did not view social responsibility as a concern for their organizations on a broad scale (Frederick). The Great Depression and World War II brought tremendous economic change and social change which moved corporate social responsibility to an area of lesser importance at this late stage of the 20th century. Other seminal works on corporate social responsibility included Edwin H. Sutherland's *White Collar Crime* published in 1949 (Post and Preston 31). This focus from the individual to the organization gradually began to change in the early 1950s. In the 1950s business had an overall public approval rating that hovered around 66 percent (Frederick 7). The idea of business having an obligation to give back to society was merely suggestive and remained on the fringes of concerns for the American public. The thought that a corporation should concern itself with more than making a profit was not a widely popular concept (Frederick 6).

William Frederick explained, "CSR was not born in opposition to the business order but was encapsulated within the capitalist system and became an integral part of the free enterprise market economy" (Frederick 7). To fully understand the value and development of CSR, credit must be given to the executives of the time who attuned themselves to their company's social interests. The full emergence of corporate social responsibility as an entity unveiled itself in the late 1950s. Frank Abrams, a self made man who rose from the bottom rungs of Standard Oil, argued "business firms are man made instruments of society" (Abrams in Frederick 7). Abrams advocated that since business impacted society and human life the natural process of corporate social

responsibility should follow. Abrams believed that corporations should naturally conduct themselves as good citizens.

Three major ideas emerged from the 1950s ideal of corporate social responsibility. First, corporate managers were viewed as public trustees. Second, a delicate balance had to be maintained between competing claims and corporate resources. Third, a philanthropic advocacy of good causes was required (Frederick). Social responsibility required an organization to attune itself to the impact of social concerns on stakeholders. A stakeholder for the purpose of this project refers to anyone with an interest in the organization, including employees, consumers, and the external community. Organizational communication considers the organization's impact from the public view as well, making social responsibility relevant to the study of organizations. As organizations develop stakeholder relationships within society their messages and organizational success depends on the strength of these relationships (Culbertson and Chen 75). There are core values to which members of society adhere and in examining social responsibility there can be no detachment from ethical values placed upon organizations from external forces.

Social responsibility has many faces. One of which deals the pressure for leaders to not communicate the truth. From time to time "business leaders are compelled in the interest of their organizations to practice deception" (Carr 145). Albert Carr wrote for *Harvard Business Review* and discussed at length the times when the truth was not the best business option for an organization. Social responsibility in communication practices helps a leader to pause and readjust his or her ethical framework. Carr points out that "here and there a business leader is unable to reconcile himself to the bluff in which he

plays a part” (147). Organizational communication is impacted when there is a clear struggle between leader’s ethics and the organization’s message.

If corporate social responsibility is examined from a public relations perspective, one approach involves the organization trying to convince the public to do what it wants them to do. An alternate approach to public relations calls for a “cooperative relationship that is focused on the need of the defined community” (Culbertson and Chen 75-76). This call toward a socially responsible turn in organizational communication practices presents a challenge. Authentic attentiveness is the communication required from organizational leaders.

While an organization cannot be responsible for the actions of those outside of the organization, an obligation does exist for organizational leaders in the United States to convey messages that ring true to their mission and values. Organizations that are operating on a global scale have received criticism for their lack of ethical practices in other nations (Freidman 12). George Elfstrom argued “corporations have the requisite qualities for moral agency. “Corporations are able to control their actions and to make rational decisions” (83). Organizational leaders have a responsibility to construct messages in international contexts that exhibit social responsibility to all audiences. Other areas of social responsibility include disclosures and truths. The recent financial scandals that caused tremendous economic grief for so many are an example of the lack of socially responsible communication practices by organizations and leaders.

William J. Sauser posits, “Ethical behavior begins at the top with actions and statements that are beyond reproach and ambiguity” (5). A leader’s communication is the place to express ethical behavior and social responsibility. An organization takes years to build a

reputation. Along with this reputation the organization's communication toward social responsibility becomes part of the organization's practices, public relations, and core values. Employees need to understand and believe in the reputation of their workplace as much as external customers. Leaders need to develop an awareness of communication practices that create socially responsible messages. This awareness may not be possible in the purest sense (Carr in Adrian 60). There are too many competing factors that may distort or impair communication; however, there are strides toward improved communication awareness that can be made. The recent financial scandals involving Enron, Arthur Anderson, and Lehmann Brothers that caused tremendous economic grief for so many people are an example of the lack of socially responsible communication practices by organizations and leaders. For organizational leaders and organization engaging in ethical communication practices, diversity, and inclusion provide a socially responsible starting point.

Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity engages all cultures, religions, and races. Diversity was traditionally recognized and protected through the civic culture. Anthony Carneval and Susan Stone point out, "while it is undeniable that the dominant civic culture established by this country's founders was essentially Anglo-Saxon, American's civic culture is not static" (16). Diversity by its very definition emphasizes differences between people. The term "cultural pluralism" was also engaged in the workplace but was not positively received. (Carnevale and Stone 17).

Following World War II immigration slowed the majority of Americans who were native born, resulting in increased conformity of values and beliefs (Carnevale and

Stone). Solomon Asch recognized that the societal shift from individual to group norms increased considerably from the 1950s to 1960s. Other scholars favored the descriptor multiculturalism which came into play in a global context. Several scholars of organization communication address diversity by pointing to “power imbalances” (Connerley and Pederson 3). If society and organizations remain homogenous, communication is less complicated. However, organizations and cultures are not static, and the cultures within which organizations are situated are not static. The world is interconnected on multiple cultural dimensions in a world that is global and filled with multiple narratives.

Leaders are called to address employment diversity through regulations established by human resources departments but also by a higher call to respect people of all cultures, races, and religions. The leaders are thrust into leadership roles with little understanding of the deeper implications of diversity. Diversity requires respecting people with various skills and life experiences. A more diverse organization includes more perspectives and skill sets. This benefits those impacted by the organization’s success or failure. Diversity education within organizations is commonplace in contemporary organizational life. Most human resource departments require diversity training in order to bring the intrinsic value of diversity to light.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that employers can not discriminate due to sex, race, color, ethnicity, or religion. The definition of cultural pluralism and multiculturalism becomes less important when one considers the responsiveness required to communicate as a diverse organization. Organizational leaders must communicate in such a way that the message conveyed is appropriate for diverse stakeholders. Taylor Cox

Jr., describes diversity as a component of doing the right thing or “the moral imperative” (11). Ethical communication became the means by which diversity flourished or floundered.

Organizations have the same challenges as any group that is trying to engage multiple skill sets and diverse needs. The move to a more engaged world view depends on organization communication supporting a message of diversity and inclusion. Diversity permits an organization to embrace differences while including a diversity of contributions and ideas. The context rich style of leaders who embrace diversity through communication creates new opportunities for collaboration and sustained success.

As a leader interacts with others he or she must have the cultural awareness to communicate respectfully as well as effectively. Cultural awareness refers to many groups included in diversity. These groups include the various races, and religions, gender, age, physical abilities, sexual orientation, the mentally challenged, and other special needs populations (Connerly and Pederson 4). Many times leaders have thought of the broader societal culture as a secondary influence having a lesser impact on organizational communication. Scholars have shown that this is not the case. Culture impacts stakeholder behaviors. Cultural awareness is necessary for leadership communication within an organization (Connerley and Pederson 4). Employee communication impacts an organization to a far greater extent than group demographics and meeting quotas. Diversity education may foster awareness and serve as a metaphor for understanding a globally faceted workplace linked through advanced communication technologies.

We cannot assume because we speak the same language that our values are the same. Organizational communication has the potential to create an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding through diversity education. Many organizations include some type of diversity education to elevate the level of awareness within an organization. One of the points employee development seeks to diminish is the melting pot metaphor, which overemphasizes sameness while disregarding difference. The result is one group having more power over another. The purpose of diversity is to “celebrate the differences that add to a more holistic organization” (Connerley and Pederson 23). Diversity gives organizational members a lens through which to appreciate culture. Mary L. Connerley and Paul Pederson suggest, “Culture continues to be one of the most important and perhaps one of the most misunderstood constructs in organizations” (25). Diversity education raises awareness about the potential of conflict within an organization that may emerge from cultural differences. Diversity education raises levels of awareness that focus on the cognitive and behavioral side of communication.

The engagement of all workers fosters an appreciation for their unique contributions that enhance an organization’s growth. Beyond the human factors organizations have pragmatic reasons to embrace diversity. Diversity has an understanding in the workforce that implies differences among people based on group affiliations; however, as diversity language has moved to inclusion a shift has occurred that give meaning to an otherwise ambiguous term. Diversity alone cannot create opportunities for engagement and understanding. Inclusion gives the action of acknowledgement. Michael Hyde posits, “Acknowledgement requires a sustained openness to others even if, at times, things become boring or troublesome” (4). Diversity

and inclusion give acknowledgement of another a place of prominence. Inclusion takes diversity a step further than awareness by implementing diversity strategies within an organization. Organizations accomplish inclusion through human communication. Organizations create order from chaos through the discussion of problems (Shockley-Zalabak). A dynamic organization requires employee adaptability, which is possible through communication. Inclusion relies on the metaphor of community for an organization. Inclusion brings the word to deed through engaging the skills of a diverse workforce. Diversity raises an awareness that fosters inclusion. Inclusion is the imperative, the action, and the outcome. Organizational leaders enact corporate social responsibility by expressing diversity through inclusion within an organization.

Summary

Organizations are faced with challenges that require authentic communication. From the onset of the Industrial Revolution organizations have gone through rapid change. Society changed as immigration provided a diverse workforce. Workforce diversity provides organizations with valuable and varied skill sets. The changing workforce requires an organization to adapt through its leaders to these changes. Societal changes require leaders to respond to employees and external stakeholders through communication. Communication is the vehicle that fosters engagement, trust, and commitment to an organization. Authentic communication is the leader's challenge. Organizational leadership requires authentic attentiveness to social concerns such as social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion.

Each chapter of this dissertation will examine a period that was seminal in organizational development and communication: classical management, human relations, systems, culture, and human resource development (HRD). Corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion will be seen through the lens of each historic moment. The project concludes with a case study on the United States Steel Corporation. This case study reflects an organization that has lasted over 100 years and has maintained a sense of authentic attentiveness to the historic moment through corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion. This project examines the need for organizational leaders to respect the past, engage the present, and adapt to the changing needs of an organization while remaining authentic to issues of organizational mission, corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

The Classical Approach to Organizational Communication

Benjamin Briscoe was the president of the United States Motor Company in 1911 and wrote an article for *The New York Times* expressing the future success of the automobile industry. Briscoe gave some clear insight to the historical moment as he stated, “Even the superficial observer has ceased to speculate upon permanency of the automobile industry” (15). He continued to explain the tremendous growth and demand for automobiles. Briscoe noted “the number of cars manufactured in 1910 will not be as great as in 1911. It is my prediction that there will be a scarcity of automobiles in the months of March, April, May and June, of 1911” (15). From these statements we glean a snapshot of the increase in production required for automobiles to be available to the general population of the United States. This historic period was concerned with production, growth, and efficiency.

This chapter focuses on the classical approach to organizational communication in the early 1900s. Organizations were functioning in this paradigm of efficiency and growth. Understanding classical approaches to organizational communication provides insight into societal beliefs and values, and reflects the business practices of the day. First, Frederick Taylor’s scientific management theory will be examined. Second, the work of Henri Fayol will be addressed. His work emerged during the Industrial Revolution and developed the metaphorical “machine mentality.” The third section examines Max Weber’s work regarding early organizations. This was a time identified with a widely expansive exploitation of workers. These problems gave rise to a system he defined as bureaucracy. Communication will be examined across all three approaches.

The final section will examine social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion during that historic moment.

Scientific Management Theory

The president at the time was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who stated, “The conservation of our national resources is only preliminary to the larger question of national efficiency” (Taylor 5). This message expresses the mentality of the period that focused on conserving resources while working more efficiently. Scientific management theory emphasized maximum employee efficiency. The model of efficiency gave birth to the metaphor of man as machine. During this time of industrial growth in the United States the country was consumed with the birth of the steel industry and a concern with increased production. The organization and job descriptions used language that gave the worker a comparison of a machine completing a task rather than a human being accomplishing a goal. Taylor’s work reflected the growing concern for efficiency and production.

Frederick Taylor began his career in the Midvale Steel Company located in Niceville, Pennsylvania outside of Philadelphia, working in the machine shop. He moved rapidly through the ranks and by 1901 he became a valuable consultant to the Bethlehem Steel Company located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Bethlehem Steel was the second largest steel producer in the United States during the 1900s.

Frederick Taylor’s approach was straightforward and compartmentalized. He published *Shop Management* in 1909 for the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. This

became Taylor's seminal work, entitled *Principles of Scientific Management*, published in 1911.

Frederick Taylor founded The Scientific Management School in 1911. Taylor was interested in human behavior within organizations. Frederick Taylor's work is referred to as the "machine theory school" or "Taylorism" (Rogers 29). Scientific management is also referred to as "task" management (Taylor 31). The government studied the daily activities of United States industry and perceived production losses due to an inefficient system. The increased effort was necessary to meet the growing demand for products to increase the economic growth of industry. Taylor believed the solution was not in men who were capable of unusual talent; the solution lay in the system itself. Taylor explained that scientific management was able to rely on laws, rules, and had a solid scientific foundation that was applicable to human activities.

To illustrate Frederick Taylor identified, five principles that these principles he used an example of the pig-iron handler. First, he argued that the handler is not hard to find, he is merely strong as an ox both mentally and physically. Second, the task does not tire him out. Third, the handler's initiative is not the reason he does the work, rather he was taught the job and he does the work because he is able to do so. Fourth, it is just and fair to men working at similar grades to be paid the same wages. Fifth, Taylor states, a raise should be based upon what is true and fair for a day's work.

Frederick Taylor's ideas are often misconstrued by readers as preferring a machine to a human worker. However, Daniel Nelson argued that Taylor worked toward developing an easier method for the worker "with a partial solution to the labor problem" (379).

Taylor saw the machine as a means to improve the life of the working man, most often the laborer or engineer involved in industry and manufacturing.

Frederick Taylor found that he had opponents to his scientific management theory. In 1911-1912, a hearing was held by the House of Representatives Committee targeting scientific management as a source of a strike at the Watertown Arsenal (Nelson). This accusation was based on the system of management that used stop watches to time human production and incorporating a bonus initiative system as a means of calculating wages (Nelson). Taylor's time and motion studies emphasized production. His chief concern was acting rationally.

From an historic standpoint Frederick Taylor added considerably to the management landscape from union and labor perspectives. He targeted efficiency in factory input and output. Taylor's theory of scientific management increased in acceptance and popular approval. Frank B. Gilbreth became a supporter of Frederick Taylor and his theory. Gilbreth became aware of Taylor's work after reading his book, *Shop Management*. Gilbreth was conducting studies of his own around the same time. In the early to mid 1900s Gilbreth and others founded "The Taylor Society" in order to further Taylor's theories with the hope of working on collective bargaining in organizational union negotiations (Nelson). Taylor selected Gilbreth to describe scientific management to the New York City Forum in 1911 because of his ability to "speak so convincingly" (Nadworthy 25). Taylorism grew as others also embraced his perspective. Studies in organizational behavior during the early 1900s focused on increased production in less time. Frederick Taylor's work also emphasized worker motivation. Taylor conducted much of his research at Bethlehem Steel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Frederick Taylor's experiment at the Bethlehem Steel Works in Pittsburgh involved coal shoveling. He worked at Bethlehem Steel for several years and gained insight from measuring and timing the process of shoveling coal: a good worker could load twice as much coal in a typical work shift using a smaller shovel holding 21 to 22 pounds of coal (Gvishianni). Along with this concept Taylor suggested a pay scale based on rewarding workers who shoveled more coal during each shift.

Frederick Taylor made the case that prior to his work theorists emphasized the worker and the employer. Taylor insisted that the "whole people" must be considered as well (136). Taylor is referring to the consumers who are frequently overlooked. The consumers who buy the product ultimately pay both the wages of the workmen and the profits of the employers. Another significant influence was the push for the conservation of natural resources was dedicated to preserving our material resources. The language in Taylor's work spoke of ill direction, wasted efforts, blundering, and a general lack of appreciation for workers and resources. Taylor did not deal with the worker in an organizational context, Taylorism was "more concerned with the worker as an isolated unit than as an organizational member" (Mouzelis 79).

Scientific management also proclaimed other possibilities. Frederick Taylor proposed four quadrants of employee "duties" (36). First, there would be a science that pertained to each element of a man's work. Second, a scientific process would be developed where a workman would be selected and taught his particular work skill. Taylor saw the need of each worker to develop his skill set. Third, Taylor proposed "heartily cooperating" to insure the work was in keeping with the scientific principles. Fourth, he saw an equal distribution of work between managers and workman (37). In

Taylor's words, "scientific management will mean for employers and the workmen who adopt it, the elimination of almost all causes of dispute and disagreement between them" (37). The objective was an approach of "initiative and incentive" (Taylor 37). These four duties placed all of the responsibility of the project on the worker.

Scientific management was best summed up in Taylor's words: "Science, not rule of thumb. Harmony not discord. Cooperation; not individualism. Maximum output, in place of restricted output (98). Taylor posited "the development of each man to his greatest efficiency and prosperity" as his philosophy (140). Workers did not view progress in the same light as Taylor. Workers thought that being reduced to a machine was de-humanizing. Many of Taylor's writings on scientific management were not received by employees with open arms. This theory was popular in the early 1900s; however, remnants of this theory continue to present day in some manufacturing industries. The scientific management approach raised an awareness of the worker in relation to the organization. Following the work of Frederick Taylor classical management theory emerged.

Classical Management Theory

Henri Fayol's interest in industrial management emerged from an early age. Fayol was born to a family of *petite bourgeoisie*. Fayol was born in Istanbul and lived his life of industry in France.. He spent two years at the Lycee at Lyon and later moved to the national School of Mines at St. Etienne (Urwick). Henri Fayol was concerned with problematic areas of mining engineering. He became the Managing Director of the National School of Mines in France that later became known as the Commentary-

Fourchambault-Decazeville or Comambault (Urwick). Under Fayol's direction, the National Mine became one of the most valued producers of iron and steel making mining, and became a national industry. His experience in the technical field combined his work as a geologist, scientist, and director. This background prepared him for the development of his classical management theory.

Henri Fayol is best known for his work *General and Industrial Management*. The translation was done voluntarily by J. A. Coubrough to expand the reach of Fayol's ideas (Urwick). The book was published and translated in English in 1929. Fayol's work provides a glimpse into the world of industry during the mid 1900s. Henri Fayol perceived management as part of everyday life. He was an advocate for including the study of management in primary and post primary education. He viewed management as a particular skill; therefore, he believed it should be taught as a skill within its own context (Carter). Fayol believed that there was too much emphasis placed on the mathematical skills in colleges and more attention should be devoted to the behavioral side of management. Henri Fayol was concerned with the lack of management education in colleges. He was especially concerned with those teaching civil engineering. Fayol posited "the real reason for the absence of management teaching in our vocational schools is the absence of theory; without theory no teaching is possible" (14). Fayol viewed the organization as a closed system sequestered from external events.

Henri Fayol's theory is also referred to as "Fayolsim" and is considered one of the most highly developed management theories. Fayol's approach consisted of five primary functions of management. These included planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling employees and tasks. The languages of the functions

themselves indicated the highly structured process of management in Fayol's view. Fayol came from a background that demanded a structured environment for safety, production, and profit.

Henri Fayol's theory dealt directly with the general manager's perspective that an organization required expert management. Fayol divided his theory of management into two areas referred to as the functional and technical realms. Functional management addressed the administrative side while technical management dealt with tactical tasks in an organization. The technical areas included operations, manufacturing, production, and purchasing sales. Each area required ample amounts of attention from the general manager.

The functional side dealt with the manager's role of planning, organizing, and leading. He posited, "Whatever the function being considered, the chief characteristic of the lower employees is the special ability appertaining to function" (Fayol 74). The higher level employee was considered part of the functional realm. Fayol observed that functional and technical management are vital to the success of business and industry. Fayol denied that his theory of management was rigid stating "There is nothing rigid or absolute in management affairs. It is all a question of proportion, allowance must be made for different changing circumstances, for men just as different and changing, and for many other variable elements" (Fayol 19). Management affairs must be coordinated because of the numerous variables involved that are required for an organization's success.

Henri Fayol advocated centralization. Fayol introduced another element of management entitled co-ordination (Fayol). This effort was defined quite clearly by

Fayol: “to co-ordinate is to harmonize all the activities of a concern so as to facilitate its working, and its success” (103). Fayol felt the organization rather than private interests should hold a prominent position in worker’s lives (Tompkins 7). He did however devote much of his theory to planning and time management practices. He addressed the need from managers to follow a plan of action, a plan of selection, a guidance of personnel, co-ordination, and control within an organization (Fayol).

Henri Fayol desired management to have a body of knowledge and practice as was the case with other disciplines. Fayol posited, “For preference I shall adopt the term principles whilst dissociating it from any suggestion of rigidity, for there is nothing rigid or absolute in management affairs, it is all a question of proportion” (19). Fayol believed as a general rule that an employee should receive orders from one superior (24). This was referred to as the unity of command. An employee having dual orders from two superiors would lead to confusion and the eventual elimination of one of the superiors. Fayol often referred to medicine as a metaphor in his writing and equated the dual situation with a body having a foreign organism, which must be removed for the restoration of security and stability. Henri Fayol added the need to include some flexibility within structure. The work of Fayol was concerned with the eliminating confusion in the related task from too many mixed instructions and orders. The third theory we move into is the bureaucracy which addressed structure and order differently.

The Theory of Bureaucracy

In the early 1900s bureaucracy was defined as an organizational structure of hierarchy under impersonal uniform rules and defined procedures. Bureaucracy was a

reaction to feudal times when equality was not present in work or society. The uniformity of a bureaucratic process was to create fairness among the workers. A bureaucratic structure protected the worker. The class system prevented anyone from moving to a better social position during feudal times, much the same as workers were held to their subordinate positions within an organization. Prior approaches to organizational production were termed “tribal methods” (Nadler and Gerstein). As history progressed some social movements influenced bureaucracy more than others. The Protestant Reformation was one such movement.

Max Weber was a German philosopher who wrote in the realm of political theory in the 1900s. *Geisteswissenschaften* was the term used for what is called the “moral sciences” (Giddens ix). Weber was interested in progressive social reform and was associated with the *Verein*, a group that had a grasp on the teachings of Karl Marx. This background is important as it helps to place bureaucracy in the context of capitalism. Weber discussed his theory as it applied to the social change which took place. At this time in history the dramatic belief of salvation moving from the eternal or other world to the present world was monumental. For the first time work was viewed as a moral obligation (Weber, *Protestant*). The world is material and what matters is what exists in the world, not in the afterlife. A social Darwinism propelled and supported this survival of the fittest mentality.

This survival of the fittest mentality ultimately led to work being seen as a sacred act which was elevated, and admired on merit of production. Max Weber’s theory provides insight to the mechanistic view of work that was perpetuated within this mindset. In general, bureaucracy served to separate employment work from private

works. An official in a civil setting would have a distinct line drawn between public and private affairs (Weber). The lines were separated to create a “closed” system of rules and standards managers used to operate the company. Organizations remained subject to various rules and regulatory standards. The term “bureaucratic” was not intended to refer to “red tape.” Bureaucracy may be considered to be a rigid set of rules; however, it was designed to protect employees.

There are several common practices associated with organizational bureaucracy that concerned Max Weber. Bureaucracy favored a fixed division of labor, a set of general rules to guide performance, hierarchy, and a rigidly separated personal and professional life. Perhaps the equal treatment of employees was one of the larger benefits of the bureaucratic approach. Viewing work as a career that was protected from job loss became another standard idea. Weber found bureaucracy to be the best organizational structure to adopt because the rules and regulations provided a system of fairness. Bureaucracy in Max Weber’s view had six components: 1) jurisdictional areas are clearly specified, 2) organization processes flow through a hierarchical principle, 3) means of production or administration belongs to the office, 4) intentional abstract rules govern decisions and actions, 5) officials are selected on their qualifications and not appointed, and 6) the official is a full-time employee with a tenured career in the organization. Weber viewed his theory as rationally emerging from leaders who were gifted at overseeing subordinates (Jain).

As organizations progressed and developed, several functions became necessary to everyday operations. Between workers the higher functions were accomplished within the structure of the administrative or technical division (Gerth and Mills). There are terms

that describe the function of bureaucracy. The terms are as follows: agency refers to a governing a structure with official duties. Authority is the power given to a leader to ensure that particular duties and rules are followed. Methods are the various means of seeing to the provisions for duties. In the realm of a private economy bureaucracy is referenced as an enterprise. Max Weber's desire was to level economic as well as social differences.

Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, Max Weber, and Organizational Communication
In order for an organization to function and prosper as a unified community there must be a clearly defined means of communication. The classical management approach comprised of scientific, classical, and bureaucratic theories fit that historical moment. However, nothing remains the same for long. Organizations are subject to the changes within society requiring them to consider leadership and employee development.

Organizations are a community of people trying to extract meaning from multiple messages. Through the lens of history a story unfolds of social struggle, changing demographics, and the evolution of language in an organizational structure. The classical approach to organizational communication gives us a glimpse of what concerned of concern the average worker. The average worker was viewed as a machine for the growth of industry. The classical period was a time when workers were exploited by organizations and the focus was on production at all costs. As organizations functioned in large part as their own empires from the eighteenth century until the early twentieth century, there were often issues to consider. Organizations (corporations) served to develop society.

The view of communication in each classical approach differed. In classical management communication does not hold a place of importance. The views of Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber are similar with some subtle variations.

Frederick Taylor was known for the specialization of work. He narrowed down each task to a specific set of functions, thus eliminating variables. This means there was no brain work or extraneous thought to the task at hand. There was one process task and one method of accomplishing the task. The task was to be completed in one identifiable method. Frederick Taylor's scientific management theory afforded little consideration to organizational communication. Although the process was very rigid and communication was little more than taking orders, Taylor was interested in the human side of motivation and looked to the humanistic side of the worker. This approach emphasized individual progress; communication with others was less important than taking orders well in this organizational context. However, the over arching desire for cooperation remained present.

The individual must cooperate with the whole, although the work was largely independent. Communication in this approach served one purpose and that was to get the work done. Communication was formal and planned. Therefore, communication in the scientific management approach was one-sided and vertical. Taylor saw the move towards a cooperative and collaboration system as well as the need to place each man in the job function best suited to his skills to maximize production. The essential communication message was man as machine, "the worker was essentially perceived as a human appendage of the industrial machine" (Etzioni 21). As industries changed and organizations grew the management of workers became more complicated. The need to

communicate within an organization was greater and required a higher degree of leader interaction. The approach from scientific management to classical management was a gradually integrated process that began to more closely examine the worker.

Henri Fayol's work grew out of Taylor's as he theorized classical management approach. Fayol was concerned with the process of communication within an organization (Nadler and Gerstein 17). Fayol contributed to the role of communication with his idea of "flow" (Rogers 34). Henri Fayol was instrumental in recognizing the problems in an up and down system of communication. Fayol's bridge was a move toward a more relational mode of communication. He argued that horizontal direct communication ought to be allowed in organizations (Rogers and Rogers). In crisis situations this bridge would save time and made sense because it was direct. Henri Fayol knew the importance of flow in an organization and recognized communication as a vital component in the process of flow. Fayol's bridge enabled workers to communicate without wasting time and effort going through an organizational hierarchy to solve problems and accomplish tasks.

Noting that Frederick Taylor's theory dealt with the individual continually producing more for the company; therefore, technical management was the major driver. In Fayol's theory of directed or guided management remained the chief driver of employees. Language appears in Fayol's work that is not present in Taylor's such as; planning and a plan of operations (Pearson 74). These distinctions are important as they not only give us insight to the progression of classical management within an organization; moreover, the difference gives us the grounding to see the linear progression influenced by historic changes. Many comparisons have been made between

the approaches of Taylor and Fayol. The subtle distinctions between the two theories are important to the development of organizational theory.

Classical management as a theory was developed from the work of Henri Fayol, one of the most prominent figures in the classical management School. Fayol continued Taylor's work by expanding his ideas more broadly within the organizational structure. Henri Fayol understood the problems a top-down system of communication created in an organization. This meant that workers A and B, being at the same level in the organization could not communicate directly. The workers must instead go through a prolonged hierarchical process before their messages were processed. If a manager had five or six workers with whom to communicate, the process of doing so effectively was burdensome (Gulick and Urwick 61). "Fayol's Bridge" explained this was a waste of time and effort. Henri Fayol developed the bridge which permitted workers to circumvent the managerial hierarchy in an effort to increase efficiency through direct communication. that scientific management did indeed have communication problems. The turn was subtle; however, the need for workers to think and make decisions became more apparent, and possible. One such issue was a manager's span of control over employees.

The number of communication positions increased the difficulty relaying a set of information or instruction to one another. There was the "line" and the "staff." Line managers communicated with line managers and staff with specialists. Line officials remained links in a chain of command. Staff specialists gave advice to their executive superiors. The assumption remained that those at the top held the important information and their knowledge should be disseminated (Fayol 35).

Communication in classical management remained simplistic. Exchanges dealt with one to one encounters resting on orders given and received. Fayol referred to a manager's command, which rests on several precepts. The precepts dealing with communication are as follows, "be well versed in the agreements binding the business and its employees, bring together his chief assistants by means of conferences, at which unity of direction and focusing of effort are provided for" (97). Fayol made a move toward bridging the communication gaps in his desire to have the manager understand projects and engage in conferences. These are steps, albeit small, moving towards the communication practices that foster understanding. Communication in Fayol's theory and remained among the upper tier of employees in the organization. Communication in the early 1900s within an organization was usually connected to a task. Communication was relegated to a chain of command. The movement of communication was downward, little upward was promoted unless it was deemed a necessity.

The bridge Henri Fayol created became a means of horizontal communication used in very particular circumstances where time impacted the progress of a function. The meaning –centered approach may be looked upon as another means of interpreting Fayol's work, alongside Taylor's and Weber's work. The bureaucratic method was the preferred process for upholding the authority of managers within an organization. Organizations functioning in this capacity discouraged employees from communicating other than work related information. Horizontal communication was not fostered as the hierarchy remained governing structure in all functional areas. Relationships of status were upheld between managers and workers in order to encourage and foster the enforcement of rules and regulations.

In Max Weber's view there existed three main types of bureaucracy, charismatic, traditional, and bureaucratic. The communication process in the bureaucracy resided in the hierarchy (Weber 17). The administration gives the orders and the subordinate follow them. Bureaucracy was to become a short cut for communication processes. This was difficult to achieve because the structure and administrative hierarchy was daunting. The command and control approach to communication consisted of clear orders from superiors to subordinates. This also reduced a sense of uncertainty among workers as tasks were given explicit rules to follow through to their completion. In leadership and management bureaucracy created the communication method that would serve their purposes. The communication process was embedded in their planning, organizing, commanding and adherence to rules. Communication was top-down in the bureaucratic approach making it difficult for employers and workmen to coordinate their efforts. For the theorists of classical management theory, Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber the purpose of communication was a rational and functional means of clarifying task measurements. The entire concept of classical management relied on the individual completing a particular assigned task for the good of the organization. While this is assuredly part of the worker's responsibility, there was no particular for the individual's contribution or thoughts. The lack of the workers' voice is the major differentiator of the classical management era.

The command and control model of top down communication afforded little room for developing a shared sense of invention or innovation, which was simply not required in performing the task at hand. The assumption existed that as management held the responsibility for organizational identity they would direct a given situation in a

legitimate fashion. This author suggests that it is a combination which makes the attentiveness to the historical moment and provides insight to communication practices in organizations. Frederick Taylor was interested in the relationship of man to task. Henri Fayol understood the need for flow in an organization. This resulted in his development of “Fayol’s Bridge. Max Weber was concerned with the exploitation of the worker in an organization if there was no formal structure. Social responsibility was beginning to become a concern that was moving gradually from society to the within the organization in the classical management approach.

Corporate Social Responsibility in the Classical Approach

The nature of the term “corporate” suggests a unity of sorts. Corporate stemming from the Latin *corporal* or body, “A number of persons united, or regarded as united, in one body; a body of persons” (*Oxford English Dictionary* 162). During the early 1900s from a social responsibility perspective the relationship was simply not important to the process of a successful organization. While there were concerns for social issues organizations did not have a term “corporate social responsibility.” This concept does not begin to emerge in organizations until the early 1950s. Change was not emphasized as part of the communication process; however, managers were responsible for smooth transitions when change occurred. Classical management provided the type of leadership that was relevant to the time which was command and control.

The period of the early 1900s in organizations reinforced the bottom line. Organizational leaders believed that the focus should remain on the bottom line and earning a profit for organizational stakeholders. A simple profit was not the consideration, moreover; the

profit was often times expected to be as large as possible. These thoughts often collided with social responsibility when the bottom line was impacted creating further ethical implications.

Corporate or social responsibility was not a priority in traditional bureaucratic organizations. The machine metaphor, which describes this period of classical management, so aptly tells a tale of mechanistic, pre-determined outcomes based on rules, and hierarchical practices. The leadership and identity of the classical management period reflects a time of industrious progress. The individual worker in the organization was not a consideration. Human centered approaches were not practical so they were more or less ignored. This may not be an intentional action; however the action suited the moment very well. In this approach and time there were no other opportunities for individual reflection or communicative practices that would enable a worker to seek another alternative.

The bureaucratic process was perhaps the most well organized and developed method for organizing. Weber defined bureaucratic administration as the “exercise of control on the basis of knowledge” (Weber). Max Weber was concerned with establishing ways of behaving that offset corruption and much of the unfairness taking place in the 19th century organization. There are three driving principles, organizations need to be built around a clear system of hierarchy, with higher levels of decision making closer to the top. The organization needed a defined chain of command. Organizations should be governed by written rules and processes for operations and management that must be followed. Workers must be qualified to perform the task for which they were hired. Technical competence served as the impetus for promotion.

The development of the “machine bureaucracy” was a term coined from the combined work of Taylor and Weber. It is hard to understand the leaps that had been made when the classical approach was utilized. There was coordination of work and an increase in productivity. In this particular historic moment this was a huge change in moving towards a more unified view of work. The classical approach is still recognized as the foundation to industrial management. The use of planning and structuring of processes are necessary to all organizations.

There were elements that were lacking. Leadership was not shared. Leadership was given to a select group at the top and their orders were followed. Creativity and individual motivation were not encouraged. Bureaucracy produced many bottlenecks to communication processes.

Frederick Taylor had some hopes for his approach which interestingly speak to these concerns that are worth noting. Taylor did realize the tides were turning towards something perhaps intangible, yet present in the air. The need for collaboration was one. Taylor expressed these in his wish as such,

“The time is fast going by for the great personal or individual achievement of any one man standing alone and without help of those around him. And the time is coming when all great things will be done by that type of cooperation in which each man performs the function for which he is best suited,...and proper personal initiative, and yet is controlled by and must work harmoniously with many other men” (140).

Taylor understood that change was and would inevitably come. History and time were components that brought about the foundation for re-examining these classical approaches. The approach and the machine mentality worked for a time. However, three

significant issues occurred that proved problematic for the classical approach. These began to emerge mid twentieth century (Roethlisberger and Dickson, Argyris). First was the wave of change which caused organizations using this approach to become less effective. Largely due to the inflexibility of the model itself which flourished in stable and predictable environments. Second, the approach ran on the assumption that the work force was undereducated and was driven by economic need. The workforce was thought of inflexible with little opportunity for mobility. As workers developed they wanted more from their work life. They wanted intangibles such as; a feeling of worth, growth, and motivation. Third, the organizations themselves suffered. They were stuck. As a result their growing complexities created problems. Organizations turned inward and more out of step with the external environment (Nadler and Gerstein 71).

As societal changes continued organizations were forced to examine their processes. This led to subtle and later more dramatic changes that progressed into an approach to organizational communication that was more human centered. Consideration was given to the workers desires and needs to be acknowledged for more than their input and output. Machines were also developing new methods of working and new products.

Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity would call attention to matters the organizational structure was not prepared to acknowledge. Identity was the identity of the organization and what was accomplished through task oriented work. Diversity and inclusion suffered much the same lack of attention and indifference. There was an effort to treat subordinates in a fair manner; however, the results were not always successful.

Identity was not a concern in the classical management approach, and diversity and inclusion were not terms defined by the organization. There was no opportunity or encouragement for workers to form their own identities. Difference was not something that was embraced and encouraged. The socially driven desire to conform and become a cog in the organizational wheel was the ultimate goal. Production was the key metaphor. The command and control authoritative working conditions left workers unquestioning, and given the historic moment which was post The Great Depression, grateful to have jobs. Men made up the majority of the workforce due to various socioeconomic reasons. The Civil Rights Act of 1875 did little to enforce diversity. The Act stated that everyone was entitled to equal treatment in public accommodations regardless of race, color, or previous servitude.

The attempt to break Jim Crow laws and give African Americans access to all public facilities failed to bring about significant change. The South was struggling with serious challenges and faced public demonstrations with issues such as blacks riding public transportation. The presidential election in 1912 did not permit blacks to vote or women. President-elect Woodrow Wilson was the first southern president and came into office post Civil War. The Civil War left distaste in many parts of the United States and segregated work places. Washington D.C. had government segregated offices where women of color worked with white women. William Gibbs McAdoo who was in the Treasury was concerned with white women working across from black women in the offices. McAdoo questioned, “is there any reason why white women should not have only white women working across from them on the machines?” (McAdoo in Woodward, Vann, and McFeely 6). This historic moment was a time when women and

blacks could not vote and had stringent workplace regulations which prevented them from interacting with white male workers.

The Progressive Era lasted from the 1890s to 1920 served to create a structured separation of African Americans from the majority of the population. Southern segregation rhetoric claimed that the segregation was for the blacks own good. Several restaurants and storefronts displayed signs reading “we cater to white trade only” reinforcing the lack of diversity (Desmond 3). Culture was not a consideration making diversity and inclusion relatively non-existent in this theoretical view.

Max Weber saw bureaucracy as the only means available that was superior in relation to other organizational forms. Weber was not in total favor of nor ignorant of the many faults and potential problems with bureaucracy. His belief in universalism advocated fair and equal treatment for all. This may seem counter to a conceptual ideal of diversity, and inclusion. This was a step in the right direction although not recognized as such at the time. Bureaucracy was in place to prevent abuse of employees’ rights. Unfortunately the process is difficult to implement when the chain of command is highly structured. Bureaucracy may be examined throughout many lenses. There is the patriarchal hierarchy that impacts gender which is often overlooked. It was problematic when many of the diversity possibilities were trapped in the web of bureaucracy unable to reach their proper place and potential.

Gender issues in the scientific management era were less than a minor concern. Gender was not an issue that existed as a diversity or socially responsible project for the organization. There were not enough women in the workforce to consider gender inequality a problem. Research has explored the concept of gender bureaucracy which

presents problems of its own. However, this research did not appear until much later in the 1900s with scholars such as Kathy Ferguson and Rosabeth Moss Kanter.

The historical moment operated within the male dominant bureaucratic model. This fits the principle of the classical management paradigm. However, research explains that the introduction of women helped to shape the definition of bureaucracy. Meta Zimmeck examined the introduction of female postal workers from as early as 1870 (Savage and Witz). The role of women in the workplace was a growing concern in the 1900s. This integration of women was first heralded as a way to increase productivity with lower wages, however once women established themselves they began to seek better working conditions and this led to a period of disenchantment. The organization had to change to enforce rules and restrictions placed on the female workers (Savage and Witz). There are other changes that began to occur as women entered the workforce. Some industries had much stricter regulations which diverted women from seeking specific careers.

One such career was in the financial sector. Common knowledge expressed in a financial bureaucracy or any structured organization implied full time, continuous work. High levels of commitment to the organization, commanding this devotion to the company suggests a bureaucratic orientation to work (Savage and Witz). In organizational work there is a cultural orientation that spoke to these historic conditions, “Within the sociology of work, this has been conceptualized as a “bureaucratic” orientation to work, and as we have seen such individuals have been described as belonging to a service class, bound to their organizations by the loyalty they render in exchange for a career” (Golthorpe, Abercrombe, Lash and Urry in Savage and Witz

106). This helps to demonstrate the lack of work life balance and the devotion required in a time when the organization wielded power over the individual.

The common element across the three theories addressed is the controlled centrality of the management system. Through an effort of equality, inequality has been given power and control. Examining organizations from the perspective of diversity makes the consideration of central management both beneficial and harmful. The extreme cases are the organizations that suffer from over structuring in an attempt to control. The other extreme may be a system so flexible that anything becomes acceptable proving risky for all involved. In all cases the historical moment called for the organization to function in a classical mode.

The early 1900s did not include provisions for a diverse or inclusive workforce. Organizations employing a diverse population were typical of these needing workers in order to meet tight deadline production obligation. Organizations hired immigrants, African Americans, and women only when white men were in short supply. Those concerned with losing the dominant white culture worked diligently to prevent diversity. The term “white” developed from grouping all northern Europeans together (Stover). During three major immigration periods the 1900s brought the largest group of 15 million. Immigration brought an influx of diverse peoples to the United States during this time; however, many Americans were not pleased and inclusion was not yet seen as important to organizations. Groups formed in order to prevent immigration. One group formed in 1894 was the Immigration Restriction League. This was a group consisting of Boston lawyers and philanthropists who wanted immigrants to show literacy in the English language as one of their requirements. The Restriction League was working to

control who would be accepted as an immigrant and who would be excluded. Dr. Charles Benedict Davenport wrote *The Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* in 1911. Benedict stated, “The populations of the United States will, on account of the great influx of blood from South-eastern Europe rapidly become darker in pigmentation” (6). Eugenics was a science that sought to control the genetic mix of people. The immigration of Italians, Poles, Greeks, Russians, and Jews were of great concern to people who embraced eugenics.

This was time of the displaced migrant worker who was trying to seek viable employment. The workers has been in an agricultural society and as society progressed and became more industrialized employment opportunities changed. Migrant workers moved to states such as California in an effort to find a farming promise land. There were Mexican immigrants looking for work who had been accustomed to finding work on farms. These changes presented not only a diversity of race and ethnicity but also a diversity of skills. Workers were entering factories and organizations who had never worked in these environments. Many workers found jobs in defense plants and ship yards. This presented more integration challenges for organizations (Graham).

In 1917 the Jones Act was a law that permitted Puerto Rican immigrants to become American citizens. There was huge exodus of Latin cultures to the United States at this time. Many Mexican workers who were miners and railroad workers were granted work in the United States due to the shortage of labor. By 1925 the United States formed the border patrol. This brought several challenges to organizations. Leaders were required to speak to a variety of ethnic groups and convey a clearly understood message.

Leadership in the early years of industry in the United States was often defined as “the ability to handle men so as to achieve the most with the least friction and the greatest cooperation”(Munson in Stogdill 9). Warren Bennis posited “Leadership can be defined as the process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner” (Stogdill 9). Leaders were in a position of authority instructing subordinates in tasks of production. There was not a high regard for the thoughts and desires of the workers who completed the day to day operations of the organization. The leader was perceived as the figure in a position of authority. A rank and file system existed within the organization much as it would in a military institution.

This style of leadership relied little on influence or communicative abilities as command and control was accepted. Any other type of leadership in this time would be out of step with the social and historic events of the time, the aftermath of World War II and the Industrial Revolution. With no significant shift in diversity the effort toward inclusion remained minimal at best. Inclusion was not a consideration. Inclusion expresses the engagement and embracing of the difference in culture, race, gender, and abilities. The individual was not a concern in that historic moment. The production and output measured through task was the driving concern.

The Corporations were in the midst of this organizational struggle to respond to changing society; however the early organization and its traditional mode of communication were in place. In keeping these issues of social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion in mind examining organizational communication through various historical periods begins to shed light on the challenges that emerged.

Summary

This chapter examined classical approaches to organizational communication. Although classical, scientific and bureaucratic management may now be considered outdated principles; they are still present in areas of industry where they are the best means of functionality. The difference has developed through history with the onset of various social and historic changes that again influenced organizational life. During the classical management period in history several theories arose that dealt with organizational issues. Frederick Taylor developed his theory of scientific management which focused on the increased production demand placed on organizations and workers. Taylor developed methods that enabled workers to produce more in less time. He also believed in fair wages for a fair day's work. Communication was top-down and the worker had little input in the organizational structure.

Henri Fayol developed classical management theory with specific areas that would help managers to conduct their responsibilities. Fayol developed a bridge that enabled workers to communicate peer to peer which saved time. Henri Fayol's Bridge began to change the organization's communication. While the top-down structured remained Fayol's bridge opened the door to communication possibilities within the organization.

Max Weber is recognized for his bureaucratic theory. Weber was interested the worker's condition and sought to prevent worker exploitation. He saw faults in the bureaucratic theory but he felt the theory was a means of fairness in the organization. Communication adheres to a hierarchy and chain of command.

Corporate social responsibility does not have a viable presence in the early to the mid1900s. Awareness is growing concerning the role of the organization in terms of community and relation to worker and consumer. Society became more complicated and full of choices. These choices brought about social concerns and ethical questions for organizations.

Diversity was growing in awareness gradually and inclusion was still struggling to find a place. These practices are important to the social responsibility diversity, and inclusion. They allowed us to reflect on our past and how far we have come. Of still greater significance is the realization of how much further we need to progress before awareness gives voice to those who have none. Organizations have a tremendous impact on the lives of working people and consumers. The practices are imitated, followed, or sometimes condemned depending on their behaviors. In this time period communication within organizations, and the topics of social responsibility, and diversity received little attention. Key points will continue to be drawn forward in the historic progression of organizational communication development.

CHAPTER THREE

The Human Relations Approach to Organizational Communication

The economic growth in the United States following World War II resulted in a larger proportion of white collar workers than blue collar workers in the United States (Rogers). Organizational leaders began to realize a need for more efficient methods of communicating in order to respond change in the workforce. One of the major assumptions of classical approaches was that workers lacked education; however, this was no longer the case. The movement from the classical approach to the human relations approach was slow and naturally took time to grasp for the business community. This was a time when labor unions and social reformists were critical of poor working conditions in factories.

As workers became more highly educated they also required greater attention. Organizations came to the realization that workers had needs and required new inspiring means of motivation in order to remain engaged in their work.

The Hawthorne Studies conducted in the early 1930s were instrumental in recognizing workers' needs and motivational desires in an organization (Rogers). The human relations approach concerned itself with the human condition of the worker. In Elton Mayo's words "the change which you and your associates are working to effect will not be mechanical but humane" (Mayo in Pennach 155). This was a very new approach to working within an organization and a step away from the classical approach.

The shift in balance and Elton Mayo's research resulted in more employment opportunities for workers with a higher level of skill and education. The labor pool included workers who wanted to have a stronger voice in their organizations. The rigid

structure of top-down management was no longer the only effective means of communicating in an organization. This was a time of rapid change impacting the structure of organizations.

This chapter highlights the evolution of organizational communication as the world of work and organizing continued to change. The human relations approach was born from the insightful research and studies of scholars who understood the impact of a changing society in the post World War II environment. Major influences such as World War II altered the playing field for organizations required a more thoughtful examination of the worker.

First, Chester I. Barnard placed an emphasis and value on communication that was not present in the classical approach. Instead of communication being a process to send task oriented information down to the workers from the higher levels of the organization, peer to peer communication was gaining interest and value. Second a predominant scholar in the human relations approach was Elton Mayo. Mayo was most noted for his research known as The Hawthorne Studies. Mayo's studies showed the connection between workers' production and to perceived attention being paid to them. The Hawthorne Studies had implications for numerous and varied areas of organizational development. Third, works of Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor, and Frederick Herzberg.

Each of these theorists brought a different perspective to the humanistic side of organizational life. Fourth, Charles Redding's contribution to organizational communication is also included. His work was instrumental in developing organizational communication as a discipline in the 1950s. The chapter will discuss fifth,

communication, sixth, corporate social responsibility, and seventh diversity, and inclusion in the human relations approach.

Chester I. Barnard and Peer to Peer Communication

Chester I. Barnard was the president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company. In 1938, Barnard wrote an influential book, entitled *The Functions of the Executive*. Barnard explained the attributes and skills that must be present in an executive for him to exercise leadership in an organization. He devoted a good portion of his work to understanding authority and leadership which began to take a different shape in the human relations approach.

The concept of a “leader” who had a position of authority required the leader to stay well informed on the most recent developments in the organizations concerning workers. Barnard spoke of responsibility in leadership and moral dealings which tied into the growing expectation of leadership responsibility. Barnard argued, “The common way to state this is that there cannot be authority without corresponding responsibility” (174). Because the skills that the executive should possess dealt with information, communication became the invisible tie that bound everything together.

Chester I. Barnard stated that leadership was to contain honesty, courage, and initiatives. He qualified this by explaining that these depend upon the situation and not upon the individual. In an organization leadership depends on both the situation and the ideas. Barnard also included intellectual abilities and non-intellectual abilities. Workers’ concerns and emotions mattered for the first time in a formal work related setting. The worker was seen as thinking and feeling person who had aspirations and desired to

contribute creatively to the organization. The focus was on human behavior and motivation. Barnard firmly believed that human actions, speech, and emotions developed from human interactions within formal organizations (Barnard 8). A great deal of his work is attributed to his desire to study and understand the formal organization as an entity that was complicated through daily human interaction.

Chester I. Barnard claimed that all types of formal organizing became a network. Relationships were built in organizations and maintained over a period of years. This interest in networks led Barnard to his examination of churches and states. In the preface to Barnard introduces the struggle with a universal approach to organizational studies. In *The Functions of the Executive*, Barnard stated, “The search for the universals of organization has been obstructed, I suspect, by the long history of thought concerning the nature of the state and of the church” (xxix). Barnard focused on the center of the organization, which was authority.

Chester I. Barnard considered the impact of organizations on society throughout history. The state is an entity that greatly influences our lives. As human beings we function on a chess board of rules and regulations that must be followed in order to remain in the game and have a positive outcome. Barnard viewed organizational life in much the same way.

Chester I. Barnard explained the impact of informal organizations on everyday life. He believed most people experienced informal organizations in some capacity. The informal organization captured many aspects of ordinary human activity. He also expressed the number of people involved in an informal organization as varying from “two persons to that of a large mob or crowd” (Barnard 114). Informal encounters are

intentional or accidental. Humans may be influenced and enticed to action by a crowd or by public opinion. One action can spread and create a chain link effect. The informal organization is indefinite and without structure. Barnard wrote from experience and observation. He viewed what had worked well and what he perceived through his experiences to be less than successful.

Communication, whatever the mode may be, uses written or oral language. Chester I. Barnard brought an emphasis to the nonverbal functions of communication. He termed nonverbal communication to be an “observable feeling” (90). The most compelling area of his work was his connection to communication as an intricate piece of leadership responsibility that impacts and directly influences organizational life. Barnard used the term cooperative effort, communication for the purpose of good, which touched the core of the human relations approach. He stated, “Obviously a common purpose must be commonly known, and to be known must be in some way communicated” (89). Personal relations within an organization were to Barnard vital components for success. He explained, “We must recognize that the individual employee is a human being, who spends only a part of his time in our plants” (*Organization* 7). He viewed the worker as a complex human being who not only worked, but also had a family and other social activities that shaped the type of person and worker he or she would become. Decision making, morality, authority, leadership, and maintaining balance were all connected through the communication process. Barnard continued his work and developed a partnership with another scholar noted for his research in the Hawthorne Studies, Elton Mayo.

Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Studies

Elton Mayo was born in Adelaide, Australia in 1880. Mayo was interested in the psychology of the worker. He conducted research at the University of Queensland with World War I victims of shell shock. Mayo worked as a research associate at the University of Pittsburgh's Wharton School in the mid 1930s before teaching at Harvard Business School. Elton Mayo was recognized as a founding contributor of the human relations school because the Hawthorne Studies formed the basis for human relations school.

The Hawthorne Studies were conducted by a group of Harvard University faculty members (Zaleznick). Mayo's protégés, Fritz J. Roethlisberger and Dean Donhans, were critical to moving the research forward. The Hawthorne Studies were conducted by the National Research Council's Illuminating Engineering Society. The studies dealt with industrial lighting. Some of these tests were conducted at the Westinghouse Electric Company Plant located in Cicero, Illinois. The Westinghouse plant employed roughly 4,000 workers who produced equipment for telephones (Rogers). The groups of four studies were designed to determine the impact of various conditions on employee motivation and productivity.

The first experiment was conducted by adjusting and changing the lighting in three manufacturing plants. The variances in illumination were hypothesized to change the behavior of the plant workers in this experiment. The assumption was that production would decrease as illumination decreased. This proved to be untrue. When the lighting was diminished production actually increased. This was quite confusing to the researchers

conducting the studies. The work spaces where the lighting remained the same also increased production. This was peculiar as there was no altered lighting in these areas. Production failed to decrease until the level of lighting was reduced to .06 level of illumination. This was quite dim.

This caused the researchers to consider possible reasons for increased production apart from the degree of lighting provided for the plant workers. The researchers concluded “it was clear that a direct relationship between illumination and production was non-existent” (Snow 257). They came up with the conclusion that the workers were responding to the increased level of attention they were receiving rather than the level of illumination (Rogers). The workers were aware that the researchers were altering the brightness of the lights. They knew their work was being observed. The purpose of the study was not the important factor to the workers. Attention and acknowledgement was the vital factor that increased production.

The second experiment in the series dealt with the relay department which was comprised of women putting together parts of a relay telephone system. The results of this study revealed that a group of six women working together and being observed for a period of time formed a team that worked together to increase production (Mayo, *The Human Problems of an Industry*). The women found the best method of increasing production was to communicate and work as a team. This was interesting because workers did not typically work in a team format at the time.

The third study conducted by researchers allowed the worker to speak freely about any topic. Several important elements came out of this study. Communication and being heard was important to the worker. Elton Mayo claimed that upward

communication creates a positive attitude in an organization. Researchers concluded that workers require acknowledgement and recognition from leaders in their organization. The Hawthorne effect is referred to when the participants in a study are aware of their part and thus behave in an artificial manner.

The fourth study occurred in the Bank Wiring Observation Room of the Hawthorne Plant. Workers in this area actually established a production rate that they set themselves. The studies revealed the effects of workers helping one another in reaching set goals and seeing that everyone did their part. The workers who lagged behind were often assisted by other workers (Etzioni 8).

Another study that developed from the Hawthorne Studies was the Scanlon Plan. The plan was named after Joseph P. Scanlon, who was an accountant at Empire Steel, and left to become a laborer in an open hearth blast furnace for a small Ohio Steel company that was later absorbed by Republic Steel. In the late 1930s the steel company where Scanlon worked was headed into a state of significant lost profits. The Scanlon Plan was the most famous study to come out of the human relations school. The Scanlon plan was an experiment in worker cooperation.

Joseph P. Scanlon was the local union president at the time the steel mill was failing. Much of the plan was tested at the Adamson Co. in Eastern Ohio. The company was a small welder of steel tanks (Time 1955). The employees of a steel mill that was failing collectively agreed to place all of their efforts into improving the productivity of the steel mill. The workers offered suggestions for cost reductions, improved efficiency, and decreasing the amount of waste. The management of the steel mill agreed to pay higher union wages to workers when production increased.

The steel mill was able to continue as profits increased and workers received their pay increases. This was an experiment in manager-labor relations. Joseph P. Scanlon became a sought after consultant in labor mediation. The lesson learned from the Scanlon Plan was two-fold. First, the workers pulled together in order to increase productivity. This was done by workers making suggestions for improvement within the organization at the frontline level. Through the workers' suggestions communication was recognized as a valuable component of an organization. Second, all members were treated in an equal manner and rewarded for their contributions (Etzioni 9). This fostered the sense of a team effort that was recognized by the organization. The labor-management system provides feedback from workers through their suggestions for improvement. The method of employees pulling together to help the steel company recover became the most notable part of the incentive system emerging from the human relations school. Scanlon became a consultant and later took a position with the United Steelworkers Union. Scanlon later joined the team of faculty at Michigan Institute of Technology and became well known in labor-management relations work (Rogers 16). The Scanlon Plan has a significant impact on labor relations in that historic moment.

The greatest significance came from the observation that workers were able to communicate and form committees. This enabled workers to discuss issues that impacted the organization as well. The workers were now able to pull together for the good of the organization, which benefited all who were involved in the process. The Scanlon Plan was able to showcase the impact of communication when workers actually had a voice in a serious company matter and were validated. Their combined and individual

contributions were made manifest; therefore, further suggestions were viewed as a worthwhile organizational process.

The Hawthorne Studies and the Scanlon Plan led to the understanding that through empirical research the importance of informal interpersonal relationships emerged (Rogers). The humanistic aspect of the worker became a topic for serious consideration. Workers desire and require attention, respect, and acknowledgement. This recognition motivated workers to join together to increase their production. Other human relations theories emerged as workers' desired the ability to contribute to their organizations. A worker's relation to greater concerns within an organization then labor continued to evolve as organizations adapted to the changing times. The next section examines the research examining workers' needs and the theory of Abraham Maslow.

Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Abraham Maslow was born in Brooklyn, New York. Maslow began his work at Brooklyn College. He began his studies in law and found he was interested in pursuing psychology. He later became the chairman of the Psychology Department at Brandeis University in 1957 to 1969. One of Maslow's most noted books, *Toward a Psychology of Being*, was published originally in 1962 while he was at Brandeis University. From 1967 to 1968 Maslow was the president of the American Psychological Association. Abraham H. Maslow's work greatly impacted the concept of worker satisfaction and motivation. In Warren Bennis's work *Maslow on Management*, he tells us that Maslow's "core legacy was to revive the full humanness to science by declaring all of our human experiences

capable of study” (xii). He was most recognized for his theory identifying the hierarchy of needs.

Abraham Maslow’s work impacted leadership in this time as it brought the humanistic perspective to light an individual’s need for self-development. Maslow’s theory of self-actualization caused leaders to look at the people who comprised organizations in a different way (Bennis). Maslow’s study arose from his observation of baby rhesus monkeys while working with Harry Harlow. Maslow assisted Harlow in his work researching attachment behavior in the baby rhesus monkeys. He observed that certain needs took precedence of others. Thirst, for example, was satisfied before hunger. This influenced Maslow’s thinking which was based on Kurt Goldstein’s original theory of self-actualization.

Abraham Maslow took Kurt Goldstein’s theory further and began to study successful people. Maslow was interested in the human desire for achievement and motivation. He selected some of the greatest minds in their respective fields. Some of these included Albert Einstein, Aldous Huxley, Benedict Spinoza, and Albert Schweitzer. Maslow came to the conclusion that all people in the study shared common qualities. They were reality centered, problem centered, real, and genuine. They also shared a sense of autonomy. From his research and observations Maslow developed a sense of a worker having a desire and need to develop himself or herself. The model of a pyramid served to diagram the process from the basic needs to the most developed needs. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs began with physiological needs, food, clothing, and shelter, which covered the basics for human survival and well-being. The second tier dealt with safety and the need to have security. Next, was the level social that dealt with the human need to

belong and engage the world. The next level was esteem which was part of the progression toward human self-worth. He termed this ultimate pinnacle of development “self-actualization” (Maslow xx). The last and most difficult to obtain was self-actualization (Maslow xx). Maslow’s theory gained the attention of organizations who sought a means of motivating workers.

The human relations approach recognized the need of workers to develop their potential in the organization. In Abraham H. Maslow’s theory people cannot progress to another level of motivation until their more fundamental basic needs are met. A worker’s motivation is decreased as needs are filled. Maslow’s point is that self-actualization is the only motivator that continues. Maslow had an argument for the manner of communicating new management theory to those who would not be as open to the concepts.

Abraham H. Maslow rested on the ideal that in “humanistic supervision” every person is transformed into a partner rather than an employee (*Management* 81). In Maslow’s view this was referred to as “enlightened management” and addressed the concerns and issues of human beings on an almost “spiritual level” (83). His work foreshadowed future approaches to organizational communication. Maslow’s work helped to move organizational theory toward workers’ needs and this led to the development of other theories. Douglas McGregor built upon Maslow’s thinking and his concern with the worker.

Douglas McGregor’s Balance of Work

Douglas McGregor was a professor of management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Sloan School of Management. He was also the president of Antioch

College from 1948 to 1954. His seminal work *The Human Side of Enterprise* was published in 1960. McGregor examined worker motivation from an authoritative management approach. He was concerned with negative reinforcement and found management and workers pitted against each other in a constant struggle. McGregor never conducted a formal study. His research was based on personal observations.

Douglas McGregor had issues with the classical approach to work that viewed the worker as someone who desired and required control in order to accomplish a task. The idea that the worker did not care for the work and responsibility was in contrast to McGregor's work. He developed a theory that stated different organizations will have improved productivity using different management styles. McGregor's theory included "Theory X" and "Theory Y" approaches to organizational communication.

Three primary assumptions describe "Theory X." First, the average human being dislikes work. Second, most workers must be coerced and threatened to do a full day's productive work. Third, humans preferred to be directed in their work. The other areas dealt with the average human having little ambition and desiring security linked directly to the organization (McGregor 33). Douglas McGregor espoused another set of criteria to be more in line with the human desires of the workplace. He termed these criteria "Theory Y." Most of the criteria in "Theory Y" are basic to human nature and concerned themselves with the worker meeting particular personal needs in the workplace. McGregor concluded that a worker required a balance of work, play, and rest. The worker who was happy with their job and felt valued would have a strong commitment to the organization.

Douglas McGregor suggested several valid points that helped to foster development of the human relations approach. There were six conclusions which McGregor deemed important to productivity in the workplace. First, expending physical and mental labor was natural to humans. People would exert self-control and complete objectives if they are committed to their organizations. Rewards in the workplace would help to foster employee commitment. The average person can learn to accept new responsibility. Human beings in the workplace desire to solve problems with creative ingenuity given the opportunity. Perhaps most significant at the time, McGregor concluded most workers were under-utilized intellectually. He stated, “The essential task of management is to arrange things so people achieve their own goals by accomplishing those of the organization” (McGregor in Perrow 99).

Douglas McGregor sought to integrate the individual into the organization’s goals. McGregor explained integration: “Naturally, integration means working together for the success of the enterprise so we all may share in the resulting rewards” (53). The concept of working for the good of all became a focus in his work. McGregor expressed the concern that perception was the most misunderstood idea that emerged in the human relations approach. He cautioned that participation was also not to be thought of as a “magic pill” that would solve all issues of conflict and disagreement regarding management’s problems (124). McGregor also cautioned against a manager using manipulation through participation as a means of control.

Douglas McGregor emphasized the need for managers to take risks. Managers who are fearful about risk fail to take chances and give employees opportunities. Workers were viewed as more educated; therefore, more apt to handle a motivating task.

Development is a natural progression toward enhancing the skills and growth of a worker. Motivation through employee development fostered the growth of the organization. Another scholar who impacted the human relations approach by employing individual development was Frederick Herzberg.

Frederick Herzberg: Integrating

Frederick Herzberg was a clinical psychologist and much of his work was concerned with human enrichment. Herzberg was a professor of management at Case Western Reserve University in 1959. While he was there, he developed the Department of Industrial and Mental Health at Case Western Reserve. His first major work was written in 1959 entitled *Motivation to Work*. He remained at Case Western Reserve until 1972 when he accepted a position at the University of Utah as a professor of management in the college of business. One of Herzberg's major studies was conducted among a group of accountants from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The accountants were selected because accountancy was a growing area of business.

The study is also referred to as the Schwartz Study. This is because Paul Schwartz, who worked at the American Institute of Research, conducted similar studies to determine preferred standards of middle managers in 1959. Herzberg's research addressed the level of employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace (Herzberg). His study consisted of managers being asked to describe a time when they felt exceptionally good about their work. The connection was based in the assumption that a strong link existed between job satisfaction and motivation to work. The employees

in the study also described a time of disappointment with work. The study resulted in identifying five factors that were strong determinants of job satisfaction.

Frederick Herzberg's findings were that 1) achievement, 2) recognition, 3) work itself, 4) responsibility, and 5) advancement contributed to employee satisfaction. Work itself, responsibility, and advancement were considered to impact a lasting change in attitude. The results revealed the "Hygiene Factor" as an important development in employee satisfaction with work (Hertzberg 99). The hygiene factor within Hertzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory referred to mental hygiene. Herzberg argued that unlike Maslow, an employee has two sets of needs. One need is the avoidance of pain and second need is to grow psychologically. The motivation factors were the recognition and satisfaction that came from a job. The hygiene factors dealt with salary, job security, and company policies.

Frederick Herzberg directly connected these to the factors of development, which began to emerge as a missing component of employee success and motivation. Frederick Herzberg wrote in the late 1950s and 1960s, a historically volatile time in the United States. Affirmative Action was passed into law with President Lyndon B. Johnson's Executive Order 11246. The Vietnam War was taking place and demonstrations were held in several cities in the United States. Some demonstrations were peaceful but many were not. A few of the major events that took place included organized demonstration. In New York City, 25,000 protestors marched against the war on March 31, 1966. Many Americans were opposed to the continued Vietnam War.

This was a time when authority was questioned. Fear grew from the threat of nuclear war. The United States was conducting nuclear tests in Nevada during the early

1960s. Space travel was a major topic, as the United Soviet Socialist Republic (Russia) launched Luna 10, the first lunar orbiter. In looking through the lens of time there are developments occurring rapidly that dramatically change the way society lives and thinks. In accordance with these inventions and positive developments there are many negative factors as well. The Vietnam War created havoc among those abroad and at home. These societal changes impacted organizational life as well. Civil rights laws were not succeeding in the fight against employee discrimination. Frederick Herzberg's work was built upon and other theorists who were attentive to social change and its impact on organization emerged.

Charles W. Redding: Creating a Discipline

Charles W. Redding was born in Colorado Springs, Colorado in 1914. Redding attended the University of Denver and the University of Southern California. Redding became the director of The Communication Research Center at Purdue University in the early 1960s. He is best known for the Redding Tradition of Scholarship. His work created the communication field's domain of organizational communication in the 1950s. Redding has been called the father of organizational communication. Universities were developing departments focused in areas of industrial communication, two of which were at Ohio State University and Purdue University.

Charles W. Redding believed that communication had the power to alter and improve organizational practices in the workplace (Buzzanell). The power communication held for organizations was the ability to reach several audiences while uniting many workers and departments. Social science was a leading discipline at this

time with an increase in studies dealing with human behavior taking place.

Charles W. Redding studied organizational practices, and gathered quantitative data over several years. He believed communication could change work place practices.

Charles W. Redding's study focused on four distinct themes of human development. The four themes recognize that employees could be encouraged through communication. The four themes are 1) human progress through empirical investigation, 2) the power of critique, 3) message exchange as the core of organizational communication, and 4) the need to understand the socio-historical and diverse theoretical underpinning of our field (Redding in Buzzanell). A teacher-scholar of The Redding Tradition: uses an eclectic approach; engages theoretical-pragmatic content; recognizes that organizational communication could alter the fundamental problems of organizational life; challenges pedagogy; respects quality and promotes the communication field at every opportunity (Buzzanell 2).

Charles W. Redding's contribution to the study of communication contribution is two-fold. First, Redding raised communication in organizations by giving a voice to the worker. Second, communication was given credit for fostering a better working condition within an organization. Greater production and profits continued to drive organizations; however, the worker was becoming a part of the organization that had attached to him or her significant voice and to offer significant contributions. Redding focused on the messages within organizational communication. The exchange of messages within organizations, and the process was important to Redding. He referred to communication as "those behaviors of human beings, or those artifacts created by human beings, which result in 'messages' being received by one or more persons" (25). Redding's contribution

enabled organizational communication to establish value through the human sharing of ideas through messages within an organization.

Communication in the Human Relations Approach

The human relations approach considered the behaviors that most influenced the organizational procedures in the workplace. In organizations communication became a key construct for the first time. Chester I. Barnard's work was groundbreaking, bringing credibility to the role of communication within an organizational structure. Efforts to communicate, understand, and develop relationships through better communication in the organization would allow managers and employees to collaborate. In his understanding of communication's role Barnard reminded the leader to be aware of the use of voice and gestures in relating to others. Barnard succeeded in drawing attention to the formal organizational world in which we live and the problematic components of failed communication.

Chester I. Barnard sought to understand the role and contribution of human communication. He was concerned with developing recognition of the importance of communication in an organization. Barnard posited, "In any exhaustive theory or organization, communication would occupy a central place" (Barnard 8). A biased opinion of communication existed at this time. Communication was viewed as a soft skill that perhaps was not as important in business development education; however, without sound communication practices and skills little else flourishes in organizational life. Organizations moved away from mere machine and function, and communication became the key to organizational effectiveness. As Barnard pointed out, "If one

visualizes the attempt to do many things now accomplished by small organizations if each ‘member spoke a different language’ there would be difficulty” (90). Various languages in an organization would make communication difficult, similar to the case of an organization with no central system of communication.

The Hawthorne Studies helped to support the assumption that worker motivation was a key effort that organizations needed to address. In some cases this was more important to the worker than economic rewards (Roethlisberger and Dickson). The human relations school afforded the opportunity for human communication to develop within organizational boundaries.

Human relations were viewed as communication practices that mattered to the organizations’ overall stability and success. Maslow gave communication an important role in his work. Maslow wanted to emphasize the importance of good communication and he indicated there were positives and negative types of communication at all levels (Maslow 47). He claimed to be interested in the positive aspects of managing; however, he pointed out that negative aspects of managing such as correction, must be addressed in “whatever proportion is realistically and objectively called for by the existing” (Maslow 47). Maslow’s theory of self-actualization moved human relations into the realm of employee needs.

Communication enabled employees to become part of a network with valuable input for an organization’s success. Economic rewards were given to workers who increasingly needed to find more meaning through work that fulfilled other needs. Employees who desired more from their work experience within an organization had the

opportunity to expand their roles through communication with others in the organization. This communication expanded to include managers and leaders.

Douglas McGregor discounted the assumptions he termed Theory X focused on managers assuming workers were in general lazy, and lacked incentive. Theory Y was an essential component of the human relations approach as it made that connection between workers needs being “congruent with organizational needs” (Shein 173). While neither the Theory X or Theory Y directly impacted organizational communication, both had a purpose for communication within the organization. Theory X managers would communicate in an effort to force and direct employees. This would be top-down in style. Theory Y managers believed humans enjoyed working. These managers would communicate to encourage and elicit ideas from their employees. Communication would flow from the bottom up and face-to face in Theory Y. The contribution from Douglas McGregor include the awareness that employee could contribute, collaborate, and desired a greater involvement in their organization’s success.

Charles W. Redding pushed the discipline to a level of propriety; thus, permitting communication to become a vehicle for development and change. Redding gave a purpose to the message exchange within an organizational structure that went beyond giving and receiving orders. The message was human centered, and human driven. Organizational communication was recognized as a key element of an organization’s success. Redding believed that communication had the power to “fundamentally alter and improve workplace practices” (Buzzanell 1). Redding favored content analysis in his work. This was detailed process of examining sentences word for word in oral or written communication. The purpose was to discern meaning. Redding included symbols as

meaning and brought language usage to a scrutiny in organizational communication that was not recognized. Organizations had a powerful means of creating value for employees and success for the organization. Communication was the key.

Historically, organizations that arose from a time of oppressed workers who had very little control over their working environments. While the human relations approach succeeded in giving limited power to peer groups and away from a formal organizational structure, the approach brought up many concerns. Workers were often pacified and management began to play games with workers in order to increase their productivity (Rogers and Rogers). Workers were often given an opportunity to participate in decisions; however, the objective was always to increase productivity for the organization. Because of this tendency to have a hidden agenda favoring the organization, many people viewed the human relations approach as “inauthentic” (Rogers 48). The after effects reduced communication honesty in some cases and enforced a type of game playing among peers (Leavitt). The human relations approach paved the way for the developments that followed. Organizations were viewed as having power in society and their responsibility to society was becoming a topic of discussions.

Corporate Social Responsibility in the Human Relations Approach

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) was not a term widely used in the human relations approach. As organizations grew in scope and influence society was impacted by their decisions. The employees who worked in organizations grew to include more educated workers who had concerns for their families, and communities. Awareness of an organization’s power began to unfold as organizations were held in a prominent place

within society. The role of the organization was up for debate. The 1950s ushered in the first concepts of corporate social responsibility. Organizations would have some new guidelines and expectations to follow.

Corporate social responsibility was gaining ground in the 1960s. CSR was a moral moderator within organizations. Management was not focused on morality within the workplace. Organizations began to gradually view themselves as only profit driven and this concerned society. They were not to add to society's problems; moreover, they were called upon to solve them. Legal regulations were beginning to impose themselves on organizations during this time, which caused some debate in the United States.

Milton Friedman was an American economist who wrote in the 1950s and 1960s on corporate social responsibility. He argued that corporations were to make profits and obey the law. Social problems would create a burden and create a cost for an organization. Questions were raised concerning the right of stakeholders to question the actions of an organization in regard to the environment and the use of natural resources. Stakeholders were beginning to have access to more information in that historic moment (Garriga and Mele).

Communication media such as television developed into a routine form of news and entertainment. One example of organized communication creating a sense of concern for the ethical practice of leadership involved game shows. In the 1960s audiences found that their favorite game shows were often rigged and the contestants were fed the correct answers (Frederick). The media brought to light the possible of unethical practices in ordinary life. A Congressional committee hearing in the late 1960s deemed that the media

had a responsibility to insure programming was honest. This prompted public scrutiny of business and organizational leadership.

There was a movement toward acting in ways that are ethical and responsible in the human relations period. Now organizations were not only responsible to shareholders and customers but also to the workers and the surrounding community. Consumers had choices and no organization could afford to make the assumption that they were the best and only option. The power of misusing business began to become a growing concern to a larger society. Much of the interest in business responsibility came from the majority of more highly educated people. Other interest came from leaders who had the role of representing the organization that greatly impacted society (Frederick). This collapse of the laissez-faire philosophy brought about many intellectual concerns.

The investment of private business had a large impact on public life. Corporate social responsibility began a debate of lasting frustration; the problems of ethics in business are always revisited. Business had a responsibility to society and leadership was part of business and society. William Frederick spent a considerable amount of time addressing the changing role of the leader in an organization. Frederick argued, “The study of human relations is convincing managers that careful treatment must be accorded employees if they are to be fully effective in the work situations and if their jobs are to form part of the *good life*” (21). Leaders began to realize pressure from society to exercise corporate social responsibility.

Leadership is relevant to the human relations approach as leadership was changing. The changes impacted the relationship between employer and subordinates. Leaders were faced with challenges that were new to the historic moment. They were

asked to have a transparency of authenticity and accountability. Chester I. Barnard suggested organizations were democratic in purpose, perhaps not always in function. Barnard's concern dealt with the development of corporate social responsibility. The conduct of organizational leaders was called into question as a more formalized process of standardization was desirable. Barnard cautioned against "blind hope in the absence of facts" (25). Leadership was developing in rank and title; however the communication and skills of the leader are more of the concern for this chapter. Leaders became more than authority figures. Leaders were mentors who could serve to help employees' development within an organization. Communication became the central key to this development process.

A more highly developed ethical practice came from the human relations approach. The degree of authority was not simply resting with the formal organizations. The peer group was part of the division of power; however, this was only functioning at the operations level. There are benefits that brought communication practices to a place that could no longer be ignored and issues pushed under the rug. Although critics of the human relations approach argue that it brought about more inauthentic communication and reduced communication flow to a variety of game playing (Leavitt). Culture and organizations were responding to developing issues in society and a move toward the ethical was a large component of the 1950s and 1960s mentality.

Diversity and Inclusion in the Human Relations Approach

The historical moment of the human relations approach was laden with turmoil and social unrest. Yet, there was also progress occurring slowly in the area of diversity.

As a leader in these times one could not afford to make culturally incorrect assumptions. This leads to an engagement based on defensive practices rather than positive communication (Connerley and Pederson ix).

Diversity in the late 1950s and 1960s may bring to mind images of race; however, diversity is broader than race. During that historical moment race produced challenges. Social awareness was growing and unfolding in the United States. While the onset of programs such as Affirmative Action brought positive change for some Americans, diversity was greatly influenced by industry specific jobs.

Most blacks and other diverse groups were overlooked and discounted in the hiring process. The Civil Rights movement well under way impacted society and questioned social norms concerning race, religion and human rights. Civil Rights potentially contributed changes in laws and workers' rights (Jackson xv). Corporations were required to exercise legal practices that created fair opportunities for all. Women often delayed marriage and became a larger percentage of the workforce. There was an increased demand for labor post World War II which created jobs and workers were needed to fill them. There a huge trend towards the humanistic and the needs of workers. Technology grew and developed in industry which often discriminated on the basis of needing more highly skilled workers. At the time most average black Americans did not have the required education to succeed. The auto industry was one of the few industries where diverse groups could find employment.

Diversity was gaining recognition and proved a major challenge to organizations. However, the concern was not widespread. Diversity initiatives functioning within an organization were nearly non-existent. Diversity referring to racial, handicapped, gender,

and religious beliefs as well as a diversity of talent was not a pressing concern. The human relations approach would however succeed to as a quiet catalyst for diversity with the concern for human relationships. The human relations approach was concerned with interaction, between the individual and the organization and individual self growth.

Summary

The human relations approach emerged from the work of scholars concerned with a human centered approach to work in organizations. First, Chester I. Barnard began to place value on the role of the manager in fostering a development of skills required for a leader. His work *The Functions of the Executive* served to incorporate communication skills as an intrinsic component of leadership. Barnard expressed concerns for leaders to use voice and gestures when speaking to employees. The worker was viewed as a human being who not only desired to work, but to contribute to his or her organization. Barnard expressed the importance of relationships and network within an organizational structure. Communication was a “responsibility of leadership” (Barnard 90).

Second, Elton Mayo’s work from the Hawthorne Studies with colleagues Fritz J. Roethlisberger and Dean Donahans contributed to the idea that a worker required attention and acknowledgement. The attention given to the workers in the Hawthorne Studies proved to be the main motivator of productivity. Mayo’s work enlightened the Scanlon Plan, named after Joseph P. Scanlon. Scanlon’s study dealt with workers responding to group encouragement in order to increase or decrease their speed of production. This was a team effect that proved workers when given the opportunity could communicate, and form a plan that would accomplish the goals of the organization.

Third, Abraham Maslow developed his hierarchy of needs through his self-actualization theory. His theory was based on observations made while observing rhesus monkeys as an assistant to Harry Harlow. Harlow studied attachment behavior in the monkeys and Maslow saw a correlation between priorities and needs. Maslow then chose to study some of the most successful people in his time. These included inventors, philosophers, and the like. Maslow contended that they shared a common quality he later term self-actualization. They sought autonomy through their ability to problem solve and justify solutions. Maslow contributed to the motivation of workers needs in the organization in the human relations approach.

Fourth, Douglas McGregor was interested in the belief that workers required control in order to accomplish their goals in the organization. Through observational studies he divided his conclusions into two theories. Theory X described workers as disliking work. Workers had to be forced to complete tasks and did not have any self-motivation toward work. Ambition was not associated with the average person. Theory Y expressed fulfilling the needs that workers had within the organization. These included commitment to the organization that rose from workers' having a certain level of responsibility and engagement. This tied directly to the motivation factor that underscores each scholar's work. As the need of the worker to belong to the organization in ways beyond task orientation became apparent, the human relations approach to further developed.

Fifth, Frederick Herzberg conducted studies with a group of accountants in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The theory developed by Herzberg was based on quantitative analysis of the accountants over time and coined the phrase the "Hygiene factor."

His theory addressed employee motivation. Focusing on employee satisfaction, Herzberg's five motivators were: 1) achievement, 2) recognition, 3) work itself, 4), responsibility, and 5) advancement. The organization had a responsibility to provide creative opportunities to motivate the worker. As organizational challenges grew, organizational leaders sought ways to better connect with their employees.

Sixth, Charles W. Redding introduced organizational communication as a field of study. Redding's tradition and work found that communication was the means for managers to motivate and inspire workers. Redding gave communication a credibility that was not present in prior organizational approaches.

As the human relations approach gained ground, the importance of the human element in the workplace was recognized. Communication had risen to a place of recognition for the first time in organizations. The role of communication was seen as a key to connecting worker with worker, motivation to worker, and management as collaborator. The needs and conditions of workers in tandem with the communication processes began to take on a more defined shape and form.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) began to gain more of position with a push from legislation and stakeholders concerning with the power organizations held. The organization had more financial and human capital than in the past. This raised societal concerns about an organization's ability to cause social problems. Societal members thought that organizations with so many resources at their disposal had an obligation to give back to their communities. These were some ideas that fueled the movement in CSR. Diversity also slowly emerged in the organization. Inclusion was not yet an issue.

The concept of a workplace more attuned to the employee and the needs of a larger society added a purpose and value to organizations. The changing face of workers as diversity becomes more than color, gender, and race, but includes physically and mentally challenged individuals entering the growing workforce. Inclusion as the action coming out of diversity begins to take form. Inclusion has no true directive in the human relations approach.

Peter Drucker, a leading management scholar, argued, “Productivity is a social, if not a moral principle, and not just a business principle, it is not enough for it to contribute to profits alone” (8). In keeping with the social trends of the 1950s and 1960s human resource scholars noted the level of education in the workers, the economic boom, and the call for ethical and moral business practices on the horizon. This will continue to increase with the turn towards a more humanistic approach in the systems and human resource approaches to communication in organizations.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Systems and Human Resource Management Approach to Organizational Communication

During the 1960s and early 1970s there was a visible cultural shift in society. The economic and political changes of the time deeply shaped that historical moment. The Vietnam War was a direct factor in several of the countercultures that emerged throughout the United States and parts of Europe. The counterculture rejected the social norms of the past. This included a distinctly different school of thought from their parents' generation. Segregation was less tolerated as the civil rights movement moved to pass laws and raise awareness about diversity. The women's rights movement and the rise of communal living brought about new sexual mores. Traditional modes of authority were questioned as citizens sought greater input government. A heightened interest in spirituality surfaced and psychedelic rock became popular among Hippies, also a counter culture of the times. The central events of the late 1960s and early 1970s were attributed in large part to the end of the Vietnam War (Shea 95-111).

As society changed organizations were rapidly experiencing changes of their own. Many of these changes were spurred by economic developments. The era of the John F. Kennedy Administration and later Richard M. Nixon's administration created political and economic policies "that impacted growth with inflation and an unsteady dollar" (Miller 132). There was more civic participation with many people advocating for human and civil rights. Along with these developments new organizational approaches emerged as well. As the human relations approach continued to evolve, other schools of thought and theories were also continuing to develop and emerge. One such approach was the

Systems School which produced a more engaged and processed work environment. The approach sought to integrate the most effective aspects of classical and human relations approaches to organizational communication.

First, this chapter examines the open systems approach, which examines the nature of the organization as a living entity that interacts with the environment. Systems theory afforded organizations the opportunity to utilize an alternative to either classic organizational theory or human relations approach. The work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy was seminal and influenced the field of systems theory through a biological approach. Karl Weick's work was instrumental in understanding organizations and their communication practices. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn informed the relevance of systems within an organization from a psychological approach to human behavior in organizations. Second, the human resource approach will be examined as part of the organizational system that developed the worker to increase productivity. The human resource approach formalized the human element of the organization and is integrated into the organizational system through the work of Rensis Likert, Leonard Nadler, and Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton. Third, I discuss the role of communication in the systems and human resource approaches. Leadership, corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion are then considered from the perspective of the systems and human resource approaches.

The Systems Approach

There are several forerunners of the systems approach. While research conducted classical and human relations approaches focused on the organizational conditions in

factories and industrial organizations, systems theorists expanded the range to a more diverse group of organizations, including industry, schools, hospitals, the military, and other varied business structures (Rogers 48). Talcott Parsons was one of the theorists credited for shifting the study of social systems from a closed system to an open system approach.

The structural functionalists followed Talcott Parsons during the 1960s and looked at organizational structures through their functionality. Parsons moved theories away from the traditional closed systems approach, which stated the organization was impacted by what occurred inside only (Katz and Kahn 6). The main criticism of this approach was the fact that change had no place in the functionalist viewpoint. The primary focus was on the establishment and stability of the organization.

In open systems theory the human component is recognized as being the most significant piece of the organizational process. Humans spend a vast majority of their lives in organizations and other institutional settings. Human behavior therefore is a large component of organizational functioning. These functional abilities create an impact upon the organization which affects leadership, communication, and corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion concerns.

The external environment impacts the organization in accordance with items and issues that most directly relate to the organization (Katz and Kahn 78). In a systems approach each part is recognized influencing the whole of the organization. The parts are interdependent within a holistic approach. The pattern of relationships between components is the key to understanding the system.

There are certain elements that belong to the formal boundary set of an organization. These typically include the environment that is most relevant to the organization from the standpoint of goals, organizational structure, and relationships with other organizational counterparts (Rogers 62). There is a structure to the open system while there is still a flexibility attuned to the influence from outside sources. Systems exist in a state of flux and they are impacted by change in the external environment (Rogers). The grounding for systems theory emerges from the biological perspective with the influential work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy: Father of Systems

Ludwig von Bertalanffy was one of the founders of general systems theory. He born in Vienna, Austria in 1901. His family roots dated back to 16th century aristocracy. He began his career as a biologist, studying at the University of Vienna. He held several positions, most notably at the University of Vienna from 1934 until 1948. He was a Rockefeller Fellow at the University of Chicago from 1937 to 1938. He moved to work at the University of Alberta in Canada from 1958 to 1968, and the State University of New York from 1968 to 1972. He became interested in social sciences and introduced systems theory into the realm of the organization. Von Bertalanffy believed that feedback and information was important to the system. Both science and human social interaction were important parts of the open system.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy's methodology of general systems theory was influenced by his worldview. He worked from the perspective of a holistic epistemology (Robots). To understand systems, "in one way or another we are forced to deal with complexities" (Robots 5). He believed these complexities could be addressed through a systemic and

holistic approach. Von Bertalanffy conducted his open systems theory from a thermodynamic approach. He distinguished three primary classifications of elements in a system 1) according to their number, 2) according to their species, and 3) according to their elements. Although his work emerged from a biological and natural perspective he was able to see the application of the complexities of human organizations. In an organizational context there exist many of the same complex problems that exist in the external environment. This is the rationale for an open system approach to organizations. Organizations are impacted by an ever changing external world.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy's work represents the earliest approach to systems thinking. The biological approach resulted in an understanding of systems from a natural point. The universal and mathematical foundations of systems theory developed into an appreciation of the holistic value within a system. This made it possible for general systems theory to continue to evolve and for organizations to become amenable to social science methodology within organizations.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy stated, "General system theory, therefore, is a general science of 'wholeness' ... the meaning of the somewhat mystical expression, 'The whole is more than the sum of its parts' is simply that constitutive characteristics are not explainable from the characteristics of the isolated parts" (31). Systems share some basic organizing principles. This sharing is separate from their individual purpose. Human beings function within an organization that is a system. Systems became relevant as that historic moment changed in recognition of the intrinsic value of the human person within an organization. Von Bertalanffy posited, "The concepts of organization, non-summative wholeness, control, self-regulation, equifinality, and self-organization, are as valid in the

social and behavioral sciences as they are in the biological” (30). The system connects human life within an organization. As Ludwig von Bertalanffy’s work emerged from a biological perspective open systems theory had implications for organizations as well. Karl E. Weick focused on connection in his work stressing the meaning of inherent communicative organizational processes.

Karl E. Weick: Organizational Communication

Karl E. Weick was born in Warsaw, Indiana in 1936. Weick is primarily recognized as an organizational theorist. He is currently the Rensis Likert Distinguished Professor in the Ross Business School at the University of Michigan. Weick wrote the *Social Psychology of Organizing* in 1969. Weick’s contributions for the purpose of this project include loose coupling, sense-making, and mindfulness. Sense-making deals most directly with organizational members seeking to make sense of their environment.

Karl E. Weick posited three assumptions in his theory. First his ontological assumptions explain the individual’s relation to others in the organization. Individuals make choices that are socially constructed. Second his epistemological assumptions recognize that the organization is formed by many individuals. Each individual informs the organization. Third, his axiological assumptions stress the values of the individuals and their impact on organizational goals. His contribution has informed systems theory as it applied to organizational life.

Karl E. Weick used the term enactment to describe the organization as a phenomenon that is created (Weick 243). Weick explains sense-making as “a recurring cycle comprised of a sequence of events occurring over time” (4). He viewed the organization as a connected network of people. He explained that change is inevitable,

“Change rather than stability is the rule in any organization” (117). In this explanation organizational members live in a constant flow of continuous events. Some level of stability is required and Weick posited that “to make the world more predictable, there must be boundaries and events that are repeated” (117).

Karl E. Weick considered the organization to be a “loosely coupled system” (*Academy of Management* 203). Loose means that there are variables that are uncommon and weak within a defined system. Loosely coupled organizations create, “A situation in which elements are responsive but retain evidence of separateness and identity” (Social Psychology 3). The pattern points to the element of the system which creates breakdown. He described this as workers gaining information from their co-workers to make sense of information they receive in the organization (Weick, Social Psychology). There is interdependence in systems theory as one component within a system relies on another component within the system. Weick viewed interdependence within sense making in an organization.

Karl E. Weick’s work *Making Sense of the Organization* explains the impact of a clear articulation of systems theory within organizations. He stated, “How can I know what I think until I see what I say?” (*Making Sense of the Organization* 95). Weick was explaining the process that is involved in making sense of things. He is approaching the organization from a social science perspective. Weick explained that systems support sense-making in the organization. The process requires “mutual understanding, redressing surprise, and constructing meaning” (6).

Karl E. Weick was concerned with the organization as an interpretative *system* in his 1984 work *Toward a Model of Organizations as Interpretive System*. There are four

interpretive models Karl E. Weick proposed with scholar Richard Daft. First, the enacting model involves managers making observation. Second, the discovering, this model favors the formal report. Data analysis is highly valued. Third, the undirected viewing model makes little use of a formal structure. Most work and processes are *ad hoc* and irregular. Fourth, the conditioned viewing model favors regular informative reports that generate from information systems (251). These four models are based on environmental differences within organizations (Daft and Weick).

Karl E. Weick referenced general systems theory to help explain the intrinsic connection of individuals within an organization. As the progression of open systems theory continued the connection to humanistic concerns and behavior became a point of research and discussion. As organizations continued to adjust to external developments open systems theory scholars Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn contributed to the discipline.

The Work of Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn

Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn are known for their open systems theory in organizational psychology, which is closely tied to organizational behavior. Katz was born in Trenton, New Jersey in 1903. He was a professor of psychology and taught at the University of Michigan from 1947 until 1974 following Karl E. Weick's work that connected systems theory to social psychology. Katz was interested in stereotyping among other topics in psychology.

Robert L. Kahn was born in Detroit, Michigan in 1918. He was a social scientist at the University of Michigan. Kahn conducted interviews and gathered data for the government and was offered a position in Ann Arbor, Michigan with the United States

Census Bureau. Kahn worked with Daniel Katz at the Institute for Social Research in Michigan. Together they wrote *The Social Psychology of Organizing* in 1978. They viewed open the system approach as an information processing system involving interaction. Human behavior is the crucial factor within the system. Human behavior has the ability to alter and change the system. They posit “Open system theory, we believe, has potentialities for overcoming those defects in organizational thinking and practice” (33). Katz and Kahn go on to say that these potentialities must be developed.

Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn developed a framework for open-systems theory that included four actions. First, energetic inputs into the organization or external influences on the organization include familiar resources such as employees, raw materials, and capital. However, they also include intangible external influences, such as status, recognition, satisfaction, or other personal rewards. Second, the transformation of those inputs within the system recognizes creativity and new product development as part of this business process. Third, energetic outputs deal with the distribution of products and services to the consumer. Fourth recycling refers to the constant flow of output and input to the organization. When a product is made it is sold and the revenue returns to the organization and pays the employees, buys more materials, and continues. The process demonstrates the holistic approach of an open system. The open system permits a constant renewal.

Change is a process that may be brought about through an external factor impacting the organization system and environment. Change may cause uncertainty. Uncertainty is defined as “the number of alternatives with respect to the occurrence of an event, together with the relative probabilities of these alternatives” (Rogers 64).

Information may reduce uncertainty. The organization must remain attuned to the environment and must be adaptable and flexible in order to remain effective and sustainable. The systems approach supported a need for ongoing flexibility.

The system provides a method of self-renewal; the organization is viewed as a living organic community. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn stated “open systems theory emphasizes the close relationship between a structure and its supporting environment”

(3). An open system approach recognizes that external society and the world impacts meanings in the internal organization as well as the organizational culture.

Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn understood the implications of the external environment on the open system in an organization. They suggest that it begins with entropy. If there is no continued input a system will run down (3). There are various definitions used to describe an organizational environment. One definition is the “totality of physical and social factors external to a system’s boundaries that are taken into consideration in the decision-making process” (Duncan 314).

Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn argue “since the organization must have interchange with its supporting environment, some of its members must occupy boundary positions” (66). In probing at an organization’s inner workings the relevant external environment must be looked at as well. This is the impact of the open system. The open system responds to external environmental forces. The organization is permitted to develop and change over time. Scholars heuristically decide where the environment ends and the organization begins (Rogers and Rogers 61). This invisible line may separate the customer from the producer, teacher from student or doctors from patients as examples of

environmental influences. Those outside the organization who interact with the organization have an impact on the environment resulting in the organization's system. Systems theory brought about significant observations concerning the impact of external forces on an open system organizations. These are organizations impacted and influenced by external changes in the surrounding environment. This includes social change and physical change. Ludwig von Bertalanffy grounded his work in a biological approach to open systems. He saw the direct link from the external environment to the internal environment. Karl E. Weick building upon open systems theory was concerned with members of organization making sense of their environment. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn revealed through their work the effect of output and input within an organization system. As systems further development progressed organizational environment instituted the human resource management approach to organizational life.

The Human Resource Management Approach

Progress within organizational theory continued to move forward, scholars in the late 1960s and early 1970s focused their efforts on the organization as a cadre of individuals coming together to form the organization. While the scientific "machine oriented" approach, the human relations, and systems approaches worked successfully in particular industries research continued to explore approaches that focused on other areas of the organization. Early human resources theory transactions were based on leadership practices. Reminiscent of Frederick Taylor's scientific management theory, the consensus early in the development phase remained one of reward and punishment. The organization was viewed as a social system. There existed

the employee who agreed to do a particular job for benefits and pay. Employees agreed to accept and abide by the authority of their manager. The style of the leader often was hands off unless there was a problem. No attention was given to good performance as it was an expectation. Management was based upon the contingency that reward was given for good performance, and punishment for less than perfect performance. Human resource theory developed into a more humanistic communicative style of leadership practices in most organizations through trial, error, and time.

In the early period, the human resources approach to organizations resembled the human relations approach, on the surface. The major differences occurred as human resources evolved over time and moved from the management of people to the development of personnel. The initial role of human resources was to control the people. As organizations grew in size and scope the management of employees became a challenge. This section will examine the work of several scholars including, Rensis Likert, Leonard Nadler and Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton.

Rensis Likert's Contributions

Rensis Likert was born in Cheyenne, Wyoming in 1903. Likert was a student of economics, sociology and psychology. Much of his research was conducted while he was a student at the University of Michigan and while earning his doctorate at Columbia University. He taught psychology at New York University from in 1930 to 1935. The field of management was long dominated by those who valued production over people. While production is vital to the success of an organization, employees are also important. In 1967 Rensis Likert introduced the “human organization” concept in his work *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*, stating that “long acceptance does not

make a matter right” (2). Likert founded the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, directing the institute for 25 years.

The idea was to look for consistency among managers in productive areas. Rensis Likert developed a method designed as a table that identified the performance characteristics of various management systems in order to show what management style would be most productive in which situations. The left side of the table identified classical approaches to leadership while the corresponding right side used human relations behaviors. The most productive managers included employees in decision making and were operated on a consistent level of high productivity. Many low producing managers still believed that they should only move toward the right after they had reached high production levels (Likert).

In his research, Rensis Likert developed a management system with four components. First, the exploitive authoritative, this system of management did not permit employees to participate in decision making. Second, the benevolent authoritative system of management was still authoritative but the employees were motivated through rewards. Third, the consultative system includes management working with employees; however, employees still remain in a subordinate position. Fourth, participative group management is a system that values communication and management works with employees to make decisions.

According to Rensis Likert, managers should adapt a style in relation to the workers’ values, skills, and needs. The system required the manager to have sensitivity toward employees. The system ranged from fear and punishment to a reward and benefit approach. This theory had the flexibility that afforded managers the ability to adjust to

individual workers and circumstances as needed. Likert's tables had many variables and were quite complicated in nature and scope. The systems of management ranged from where the organization is currently and where it may be in two years time. Managers needed to consider what type of organization was being created and where the organization's ideal place would be on the table (Likert 211). Some of the areas on the table dealt with the extent to which superiors have confidence and trust in subordinates to accept, resist, or reject goals (208). Likert described linkages that formed among departments that formed among departments. These linkages would form the cross-functional work groups that became a part of this process of change. Likert recognized the networking impact of communication within an organization although it was not formalized at this time.

Managers expressed that this "interest-people approach" was a luxury that could not be afforded; therefore, these managers never made the connection between a human concern for workers and productivity. Rensis Likert's work illuminated the connection between labor relations and management in specific management systems. Various styles of supervision identified the interdependent points of contact that yielded the greatest benefits to the organization. The effective organization had a certain "character" (Likert 47). Likert stated, "The more often the supervisor's behavior is ego- building rather than ego-deflating, the better will be the effect of his behavior on organizational performance" (47). Likert's contribution is important on many fronts.

The effective organization is seen as interdependent and interacting. Networking accomplishes this task. This was expressed as a supportive relationship between employees and employers. Rensis Likert moved human resource management into the

area of human resource development. As human resource evolved the approaches included a look at human behavior. Many human resource theorists explored the concept of worker recognition, one such theorist is Leonard Nadler.

The Work of Leonard Nadler

The 1970s produced many products and lifestyle changes that influenced society and organizational practices. The concept of social welfare was growing. Managing people was becoming a science of business and behavior. Leonard Nadler was a professor emeritus at George Washington University from 1965 until 1988. He became known for his research in managing the human resource development unit. Nadler was credited with coining the term human resource development (HRD) Nadler's work could not have been written a decade earlier (ix). Scholarly literature introduced recognizing the value of the worker was sufficiently developed. The introduction of the human relations approach into industry and corporate life continued to change the way employees viewed their work.

When Leonard Nadler was writing, there was no defined method that was deemed best in the effective management of people. Nadler conducted most of his research through consulting with numerous organizations. He saw the need for a development process that placed human resource development central to the education and development of the individual within an organization. One of the major tasks Nadler faced was defining the role of human resource development within the organization. Nadler claimed that when asked the question, "What makes your organization successful?" the responses were widely varied (Nadler 1). Credit was given from marketing efforts to financial savvy. These were and still remain vital to the success of an

organization, little acknowledgement was awarded to the people who comprise departments and units within an organization. Leonard Nadler argued that there are three major components that contributed to organizations' success. These are financial resources, physical resources, and human resources (Nadler 3). These three areas are the mainstay of any organization. Nadler posited, "Releasing human potential is a necessity. "People usually have more in them than expected and can be more effective than they are" (95). Nadler wrote extensively on the need for employee development. In this view the organization was in part responsible for the development of the employee and had the task of helping them to complete their goals.

Managing people became a system of educating and supporting employees. This was a major historic turn from "man as machine" to "worker as a valued human being." In order for organization to move forward and grow, employees desired training as well placement in higher level positions. During this time employees who started in the mailroom aspired to climb the corporate ladder. Leonard Nadler saw the need for the individual to take on responsibility for his or her development as well. Nadler saw HRD providing employees the opportunity to explore experiences that may be valued in the workplace. Nadler's work contributed to the growing development of human resource management. Research in management styles and leadership required discernment in order to meet the challenges of employee development. These changes engaged other theorists to discover methods of supporting employees in their developmental needs. The next section examines the work of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton.

The Work of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton

Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton were researchers who studied psychology and human behavior. They worked together at the University of Texas in the 1960s. They are best known for their work which developed the managerial grid in 1964. The grid was a matrix consisting of four management styles that conceptualized a manager's interaction with employees.

This grid was based on various elements of style in leadership and communication as it dealt with conflict, behavior, and change elements that management addressed on a regular basis. The purpose was to identify behaviors that would result in the most effective leader. The managerial grid divided the organization into concerns for people and concerns for performance (Northhouse).

The managerial grid was regarded as one of the first attempts to quantify management behaviors. The grid is based on a scale from one to nine. One is the lowest in any particular area and nine is the highest possible score (Blake and Mouton 12). The country club management style has high concern for people and their needs. This creates a pleasant working environment. The team management style has high concern for trust and respect resulting in the accomplishment of work through mutual commitment. This is the highest 9.9 quadrant (Bake and Mouton 14). The authority-obedience style has low concern for people. It is impoverished requires a minimum effort to remain within the organization. This is the lowest and rates 1.1 in the overall grid. The lower right quadrant is a mix as the result is authority-obedience. This quadrant is looking for efficient results with a minimum of human interference with a rating of 9.1. This is perhaps the most extreme with the largest gap in balance. The center of the managerial grid is the most

balanced with an overall rating of 5.5. This is the organization man management center or the “middle of the road” or “conformity to the status quo” (13). The center is not necessarily the most productive. Work is accomplished through maintaining worker morale and satisfaction (12).

Scholars addressed tactical management problems along with the need to better train and develop workers in the systems and human resources brought about slow changes in the perception and function of human resources. A paradigm shift occurred that was greatly impacted by society and the movement towards more highly educated and informed workers. In review the organization as a social structure took several years to understand and develop to a process of training orientation. The developments were successful in bringing an increased interest in the vital role of communication with an organization. The next section examines communication in the systems and human resources approaches.

Communication in the Systems Approach and Human Resource Management Approach

An open system implies an ever changing organizational environment. Most communication systems are open (Thayer). Communication was a central component to the systems approach which also serves to separate the approach from the previous schools of thought regarding management and organizational function.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy conducted his research when the down- top approach was predominant. A social system is structured of more intangible events than other similar physical systems. Intangible events make communication; vital an organizational is fluid. Because the system has intangible qualities the emphasis rests on the functioning

component of the system (Katz and Kahn). An important aspect of an open system is the impact of the environment upon the organization. Communication is also influenced as organizational structure and technological changes occur. Several components leaned toward organizations and communication practices in a very specific way. Goal seeking suggests that all of the interaction must result or move toward the goal or objective result being met (O'Connor and McDermott). An interdependence was produced which served as the key to connecting all of the pieces (von Bertalanffy). There is a connection between wholeness that recognizes the relationships to the environment, and supports adaptive and goal seeking behavior in organizations (Buckley 2). Interconnectivity is the key to communication. If communication is viewed through the lens of an information system, then communication also exists as a social system within an organization (Katz and Kahn 428). This feedback produces a degree of self-regulation so that balance may be restored. The ability of open systems to reach the same end in the midst of varied conditions is termed "equifinality" (Rogers 51).

Communication held a place of vital importance in an open system as the organization was part of the environment and was directly impacted by the external communication. Open systems placed the success of their organizations in the connection between environment and organization. An open system has the unique ability to give feedback which is so important to positive communication within an organization. The environment places a strain and stress on the open system as it responds to external conditions. The rapid pace of an organization impacts communication much in the same manner. Gerald Zaltman stated, "The interaction between the organization and its environment is crucial to the innovation process" (120). Change is a natural part of any

organizational life cycle and is usually a result of flux in the organization's environment. Communication influences workers' response to change in an organization.

A systems approach broadens the capacity for communication and feedback that is so critical to organization success. As organizations began to function in more complicated ways they needed to foster and grow the social system. Inadequate and faulty communication practices created many problems in the systems approach. Open systems are directly impacted by their environment. Thus communication within and apart from the organization both deflects and reflects the organization's culture and climate.

Rensis Likert's scale preferred a higher level of supervisor to subordinate interaction and cooperation. Rensis Likert's scale of profiling organizational characteristics concerned itself with measuring the impact on leadership based on the topic of communication that occurred within an organization. Communication in Likert's view focused on meeting the goals and objectives of the organization. In order to be successful in these areas there was a high level of interaction with individuals and groups. Also the flow of communication tended to move down and up and across to include co-workers. Downward communication was successful coming as a top level implementation or directive. Communication was a key element that was continuing to slowly gain ground in value and integration within organizational structures. The more human centered an organizations becomes the greater the need for communication that supports and fosters the organizational process. A key component was the willingness for management to share relevant information with subordinates. The interesting aside from

this study was the realization that oftentimes too much open communication was viewed with suspicion by subordinates (Likert 201).

Rensis Likert focused “effective coordination” (Human Communication 173) to explain the value of cross functional work groups in organizations. Cross functional teams require a high level of cooperation. Cross functionality made it possible for workers to step into areas outside of their normal responsibilities. This was a significant shift in organizational knowledge sharing. The interactivity between various organizational departments improved gradually. Productivity gave workers a sense of greater contribution toward the organization’s goals. Workers were motivated in a positive manner. As management and organizing became more complex, communication became more relevant to the organization.

Leadership began to move and change in order to better adapt to the new leader who would need to possess a higher level of communicative skill sets in order to sustain a productive and viable organization. Likert raised an awareness of various styles of communication when supervising employees. The research he conducted found that managers tend to manage in the style and leadership principles of their superiors. Communication held the key to relationships that were both supportive and gave a sense of worth to the employees. Supervisors are often misunderstood because of their managers’ failure to verbalize their intent rather than acting it out or behaving in a certain manner (Likert 11). Discussion and open communication among employees to managers, managers to supervisors and supervisor to superior was not common practice.

Rensis Likert argued, “Communications are required for coordination in a changing organization, particularly communications of a challenging and differing

character” (Likert 1969). Likert was not just looking at lateral or upward communication. He suggested a “man-to-man linkage” (1969). Coordination was of value to Likert, thus, the organization required a coordinated mode of communication. Process became an important factor in the overall organizational approach. One of the processes Likert addressed was the issue of conflict as part of organizational life. The need to effectively address conflict was part of the human organization. When lateral communication was part of the organizational process coordination became effective.

Leonard Nadler’s work noted that managers need to communicate closely with workers in order to become understanding and effective. Production was improved through the openness afforded in direct communication.

Communication was continuing to gain vital ground as a necessary and valuable component of any organization. Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton’s managerial grid cited open communication on the grid as significant. Open communication works toward solving many problems in the organization. Individuals have access to the information they need in order to complete their jobs effectively. The information is not held secretly but shared among workers in a responsible manner for the successful completion of tasks. Conflicts are resolved through more open communication practices of confrontation, with understanding and agreement as the basis of cooperative effort (Blake and Mouton). Confrontation was understood as problem solving in this model and holds a positive connotation. Decisions were equally sought to bring about a better understanding of issues and mutual agreement when possible. The grid was designed to help facilitate problem solving when possible.

Communication through leadership through the grid approach had a direct tie to understanding and language. Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton sought to identify the contradictions in many of the leadership theories (198), noting that leadership has several major components that cannot be separated. Black and Mouton suggest that the structure of “language and thought must be addressed in the context of Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian orientations” (198).

Corporate Social Responsibility

Historically, the systems approach began at a time of turmoil and change in the United States. Many segregated groups searching for individual autonomy. The 1960s and 1970s were filled with demonstrations, labor movements, the women’s movement and civil rights issues. These events changed and greatly influenced the attitudes and expectations of organization’s and their employees. Management within an organizational system was under great debate during the 1970s. Scholarship in the area of management studies was declining which also impacted organizations. There was an overall dissatisfaction with the field of management, “the managers of the 1970s are going to be less willing than their predecessors to accept management knowledge or guidelines based solely upon expert authority” (Estafen 54). The expectation was that managers would become increasingly responsible for finding answers to the challenges of everyday organization life. These problematic areas included corporate social responsibility and diversity.

Managers were not facing the challenges alone. In the 1970s the dawning of a new approach to business regarding its role in society emerged. Social corporate

responsiveness was a new term that referred to the ability of an organization to respond to societal pressure (Frederick 40). One of the major questions was “will the organization respond” (41)? Managers had an additional role. Managers and leaders need to become attentive to social issues. This new way of thinking about organizational life presented many problems. The consensus had remained that organizations in the past often placed social problems in a category of their own. The response was reactive and not proactive. General public opinion lent towards the expected responsiveness of the organization. This was the way society and the system viewed corporate responsibility. The work of William C. Frederick explained that the 1971 Research and Policy Committee issued a statement expounding, “government based business partnerships for social progress” (Frederick 42). The entire concept of corporate social responsibility as a field was new and still remains a field that continues to incite debate. These changes greatly impacted the organizational culture which is the system. They are intrinsically connected through the humanistic component that connects the worker to society through his or her organization.

The late 1960s through the 1980s was one of tremendous, rapid growth in various industries. Health care, manufacturing, and research and development organizations were among the top production facilities (Post and Preston 13). This was a time when the government provided funding for research. In 1965 president Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Medicare Act which provided health care to the elderly who were eligible for social security. The Medicare Act gave health care increased spending abilities. Innovation became a major concern as the health care industry experienced demand for new products. From an open system approach, organizations were directly impacted by

the environment. Social changes were forcing changes in private and public organizations.

There was fear of growing corporate power and government encroachment, the rapid rise of managers within corporations and a lacking system of accountability. In the systems approach a way of approaching social responsibility develops through organizational trustworthiness. Studies have shown that trust is a huge component for success within and apart from the organization. Issues plaguing organizations often deal with issues of ethics and diversity.

One industry particularly affected was the pharmaceutical industry. In the early 1960s Senator Estes Kefauver conducted hearings targeting the “excessive pricing of prescription drugs” (Insight Team). This was a social concern. The publicity of cases such as these raised a growing concern that fostered a mistrust of corporations and big business. Trust and the questioning of authority that impacted society also impacted organization’s public image. The bill was in danger of not passing when the story of the thalidomide babies came to light and the American public was made aware of the tragic story. This was a case of babies born deformed as a result of drugs having no regulatory guidelines. The bill pass and was signed into law on October 18, 1962 as a congressional response to the public pressure for drug regulations (Post and Preston 57). This serves as a clear example of organizations in an open system responding to external factors that led to a more responsibility practice within the pharmaceutical industry. This is one example among many that have occurred across various industries. Social responsibility creates change according public outcry and in addition to communication practices within and apart from organizational practice.

Scholars James E. Post and Lee E. Preston posited, “Organizational responses to changing environmental conditions do not always proceed in linear fashion, nor are they always based on accurate perceptions of the environment” (83). Communication served to help processes of change in organizations responding to external forces. Open systems are perhaps more intuitive applications of knowing as they inform the organization. The organization changes based upon the information. The organization may or may not change or innovate based upon the information. During this time an anti-business sentiment arose. The thought emerging suggested the need for business organizations to “work for the betterment of society” (Frederick 37) and was viewed as an obligation of the corporate world. This gave birth to a more structured approach to corporate social responsibility.

There was widespread debate as to the direct cause of this change; however, most sources agree on the economic and social events of the time. There are interesting studies suggesting that organizations with high proportions of women are viewed as untrustworthy at times (Perrow). This may be traced back to the system being picked apart into individual units. Women in an organization are only a part of the total organization. Minorities and women received less support in managerial practices (Hodson 440).

Diversity and Inclusion

One important impact that systems theory introduced through education was the ability to change mental models. These models developed from preconceived notions of what the workplace and workforce should encompass. Diversity serves to change and

enrich mental models by the act of inclusion. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn approached the culture of the organization as a system of roles. Roles are an integrated part of culture. They are a measure of communication and they influence the organization (Katz and Kahn 191). Rewards and sanctions become a part of the organizational culture. Through an organization's cultural process roles are established and those not meeting the standards agree upon with the organization's culture suffer the sanctions. In a culture that communicates messages of diversity and inclusion the needs of an eclectic mix of people need to be met. These transformative organizational changes resulted in a need to engage diversity and inclusion.

There needs to exist an increase in the understanding of cultural attitudes in terms of diversity and inclusion. Introducing diversity in an organization is not as needed as embracing the idea of inclusion. Diversity focuses on the differences and organizations are moved to go beyond that to the future which includes integration. In this historic moment of the 1960s to early 1970s diversity has a place. Although diversity did not have a firm hold in this historical moment there was a desire to understand the implications of diversity and the benefits within the organization. Diversity spokes to a variety of talents of abilities. Diversity also spoke to meeting requirements.

Human resource management introduced corporate diversity in the early stages largely meant hiring to fill quotas. In the 1970s diversity in the workplace remained concerned with relations between blacks and whites (Jackson 7). There was little attention to the various skills an employee brought to the organization. Diversity was a buzz word that received a lot of press and internal edicts; however, nothing authentic

developed. Diversity challenged organizations to consider alternatives in their hiring process.

While laws brought organizations to an initial understanding of diversity they served to open doors and raise awareness where none existed. The historic moment told us that the workplace was no longer homogeneous. A mentality existed within many organizations that suggested diversity in their view was outside and the organization was somehow separated from diversity. This was an unhealthy to change. Diversity was change in this historical moment. Everything was impacted as managers struggled with issues of culture and race. Each of these issues impacted employees and leadership of the organization. Diversity in that historical moment was dealt with the introduction of men and women in a workplace who were now interacting more often. They were of various races and cultures. This was another problematic area that fell in to the diversity challenge. Many generations were overlapping in the workplace as well.

Organizations had their organizational development departments teaching what was termed sensitivity training. During the previous decade President John F. Kennedy has established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Through the progression of several acts in congress in 1971 President Richard M. Nixon made revisions to an executive order requiring contractors to develop an affirmative action program. This order required specific goals to be met and a time table to be followed. Laws and regulations served to put checks and balances into place; however rules do not change the attitudes held by certain people. The workplace had issues of long standing stereotyping that laws and rules could not resolve. Historically, was a time when rules and laws were coming into place to provide for a changing, diverse work force.

Organizations that were attuned to these societal changes adapted much better than organizations who continued viewing diversity, and inclusion as an external problem.

Inclusion is the action within diversity. This historic moment did not approach inclusion in the true sense. The incorporation of a varied pool of workers was instituted through government bills and laws that spoke of compliance. The humanistic component of inclusion was a step toward moving diversity from an organizational strategy to an organizational action. As that historic moment changed the issues that encompassed a diverse workforce changed as well. Issues that demanded action moved inclusion to a strategic place in organizations. This move to action from productivity to human acknowledgement was no longer neglected. Organizations began to value a diverse workforce and inclusion enabled more deeply engaged worker participation.

Summary

This chapter served to examine the changes taking place in organizations through the systems and human resource approaches. Through the work first, Ludwig von Bertalanffy in his biological approach to systems a holistic perspective was gleaned. The connection of an open system to the external environment proved to be a direct impact on organizations. Second, the organization was perceived in the system approach through the work of Karl E. Weick and third the work of Robert Katz and Allan Kahn.

In the human resource approach there is a turn toward the development of employees in accordance with an organization's need to manage people. First, Rensis Likert's work was examined in his desire to match manager's styles to workers' needs. Second the work of Leonard Nadler was reviewed as human resources developed into a discipline.

Third the managerial grid of Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton was examined as the grid provided four quadrants that placed management styles into models for organizational development.

Communication developed in each model in relation to the historic moment and the development of workers who wanted more recognition and input in their daily work life. Workers desired to contribute through time and talent to their organizations. Workers also desired acknowledgement. The desire was not self-serving; moreover, the desire stemmed from a population of workers who were more highly educated and had valuable contributions to make to the growth of their organizations. Increased participation through adaptive communication enabled this to occur.

Corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion were growing concerns. Many of the pressures came directly from external sources. Government regulations and social unrest brought about many organizational changes. The organizations that saw true benefits from the development and engagement of workers proved fruitful. Diversity and inclusion permitted successful organizations to grow through the inclusion of varied talent through a diverse workforce. That historic moment called for the development of the worker. The next chapter examines the organization through the critical-cultural approach.

CHAPTER FIVE

Cultural-Critical Approaches to Organizational Communication

Organizations in the late 1970s were experiencing several new challenges. These changes required a response from organizational management that addressed greater competition and practices. The 1970s were a time filled with social experiments. Society had adapted changes that included a society that was working to help others to a society that in the 1980s became very individualistic. Population growth created the Sunbelt with many people migrating to California and Florida. Reaganomics instituted by President Ronald Reagan was a reaction to the recession in 1982. The economy slowly recovered and workers were seeking to make money in organizations. Higher education was experiencing a surge of interest. The idea of an education that would enable a greater ability to make money was very admirable in the 1980s mentality of consumption.

This was a time of technological wonders. The computer was an addition that revolutionized the workplace. Organizations had a tool that increased efficiency and created opportunities via the Internet. Many households purchased personal home computers during this time as well. Health concerns rose with the introduction of Auto Immune Deficiency Syndrome or Aids. This disease created fear and social isolation for Aids sufferers created new challenges for organizations who had employees with confirmed cases. During this time the developments both good and bad served to increase a growing awareness of change within organization. Organizational Development became an area that was created to develop employees and the organization through education. Organizations were recognized as a culture and communication adapted to meet the demands.

Cultural approaches to organizational communication developed as organizations became more employee centered. Culture encompasses all aspects of an organization and impacts the growth of an organization. Critical approaches deal with the critique of culture. Organizations in the late mid 1970s and 1980s began to recognize the value of employees who are more diverse in background, education, and experiences. This chapter will first address cultural approaches to organizational communication. Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy's prescriptive theory addressing four types of organizational culture is examined. Edgar Schein's descriptive work on cultures informs organizational development. Second, critical theories were imported into the study of organizations in seeking to include all employees equally. The work of Karl Marx and Stanley Deetz as his work informs a discussion of organizational culture. Third, feminist approaches, examine the work of Julia T. Wood and Cheris Kramarae. The use of communication will be reviewed. A discussion of corporate social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion close this chapter.

Cultural Approaches

Organizational culture describes the shared experiences of employees within an organization. Culture is shaped by communication operations in organizations. Culture is defined as a set of "shared basic assumptions" (Schein 17). Shared experience holds the most value for organizational norms. Culture includes the rituals and symbols that an organization has come to accept as their own unique patterns of behavior in the workplace. Clifford Geertz, a noted anthropologist, defined culture as "the fabric of meaning in terms which human beings interpret their experience and guide their action"

(Geertz 145). The debate begins when culture is believed to be what the organization stands for as opposed to the structure and function of an organization (Smirich and Calas 1987).

Culture may be intrinsic to the organization and not clearly visible to those outside the organization. Culture is formed by organizational systems that have been adapted by an organization or group. Culture shapes and is shaped by an organization's communication. When a new organization is created the cultural factors are more malleable; the culture is shaped through growth and patterned responses. A long standing highly developed organizational culture is often resistant to change. The culture has emerged as a result of years of repeated communication patterns.

A practice or process may impact the culture by restricting communication among its members. Organizational culture as communicative practice deals communication in the daily operations and activities of the organization. Culture informs action yet culture is driven through communication. Organizational culture is derived from communication practices within the organization (Martin in Jablin 351). There are four factors that go into the development of culture 1) time, 2) event, 3) space, and 4) message flow (Hall 1). Each one of these four processes is necessary and is indeed part of the day to day functioning aspects of an organization.

There are three main issues that influenced organizational culture scholarship. First, organizational culture is complicated. Second, culture is emergent. Third, culture is not unitary (Miller 95). Organizational culture must be examined from a perspective that considers all of the individual systemic approaches of an organization's culture.

Shared experiences permit bonds to form among workers and systems, which allows patterns to emerge. Examples of shared experiences in a work environment may include a team struggling through a difficult project or individuals dealing with a demanding boss. Culture also creates a sense of community within the organization. An organizational culture has a synergistic quality that encompasses ideas, implementation and the ability to share in the reaching of a common goal

This section will examine organizational culture from two distinct approaches. First of Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy offers a prescriptive approach to organizational culture. Second, Edgar Schein offers a descriptive approach.

Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy's Approaches

Terrence E. Deal was the Irving R. Meebo clinical professor at the University of Southern California, Rossier School. He retired from the university in 2009. Deal has written extensively on organizational culture. Allan A. Kennedy is a writer and management consultant from the Boston and London, England area who works in the area of corporate culture. Deal and Kennedy collaborated to write *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life* in 1982.

Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy also discuss types of cultures within organizations. Through their research they observed organizations that were successful and looked for a common denominator. The organizations included IBM, General Motors, and Kellogg among others. Deal and Kennedy concluded these organizations had strong cultures. Strong culture expresses the values and beliefs that all members of an organization adhere to in a universal manner.

Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy work from a prescriptive view of culture. They believe that successful organizations can be recognized in terms of employee behaviors as they shape the organization's culture. Strong cultures create employee buy-in and are centered on values, rites and rituals, and communication networks. Values are the tightly held beliefs within an organizational culture held by all members. "Values are not hard like organizational structures, policies, procedures, or budgets. Often they are not even written down" (Deal and Kennedy 22). Heroes are people who most exemplify the organization's values. Narratives and tales of the heroes within the organization support the organization's values through the hero. Rites and rituals serve to reward and strengthen accomplishments. The cultural network refers to the communication that enforces and maintains the cultural message within an organization (Miller 93). Strong cultures exemplify specific organizational values that form their cultures. Deal and Kennedy have four types of strong organizational cultures according to their work orientation. First is "work hard, play hard" cultural pattern. This system gives rapid feedback and response.

Second, the "tough-guy macho" culture has a rapid feedback and reward with a high risk. The stress develops from the fear of losing the reward or recognition. The most important focus is on the task. This style of culture suits public safety and danger, medical personnel, and sports organizations. A third model is the "process culture." This culture has slower feedback and reward. The risk is relatively low. The stress level is low as this type of work moves along consistently with little change. Frustration could arise from the slow systems and bureaucracies that impede change. The main focus rests on the past and the future. Organizations with this type of culture commonly include financial

institutions and insurance companies. The fourth model is “bet-the company” which is slow feedback and reward with high risk. This model involves big stakes and risk taking which may take years to develop into a completed project. The greatest stress is not from knowing the outcome of projects but from the lack of attention to planning. These would include organizations in manufacturing and oil or gas companies (Deal and Kennedy 28). Prescriptive approaches to organizational cultures are often critiques because they do not seek to understand an organizational culture. The approach tends to favor correct methods of organizational functions in term of values and beliefs. The objectifying of cultures fails to permit scholars to. The next section examines the descriptive approach to culture and the work of Edgar Schein.

Edgar H. Schein: Culture

Edgar H. Schein is a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the Sloan Management School. Schein’s work entitled *Organizational Cultural and Leadership* was published in the 1985. This was a time of psychological studies in organizational behavior; the individual was acknowledged as a contributing member of the organization’s culture.

Organizations have a way of communicating that is often culturally bound. A definition of culture within an organization proves problematic. Edgar H. Schein examined this phenomenon in his work and theory of culture. Schein suggested, “When we apply the concept of culture to groups, organizations, and occupations, we are almost certain to have conceptual and semantic confusion, because such social units are themselves difficult to define unambiguously” (Schein 11). Culture within an organization is not different. Organizations have their rituals, group dynamics, and

preferred methods of communicating. Schein also explains that the formation of an organization's culture is not entirely observable (Schein 1985). Edgar Schein argues that culture is formed in two ways. Spontaneously, through day to day interactions that become norms and through the guidance of a leader who develops the culture and norms because they serve to create the organizational culture (Schein 15).

Edgar H. Schein espoused three layers in his theory of corporate culture. The image is one of an inverted triangle. The first layer represents artifacts and behaviors. The second layer includes espoused values. The third layer consists of organizational assumptions. Artifacts can be tangible such as clothes and office décor. Artifacts can be verbal as well representing jokes and language. Historical facts and data would be part of artifacts as well. Culture functions as an artifact when the product of an organization is an artifact of the human interaction required to accomplish the task. Employee behavior is the enactment of culture. (Jenks 11).

Espoused values are statements used regularly by the CEO or read in mission statements. They may include mottos such as "safety first," all members of the organization recognize and repeat the mantra or motto as part of the values of the organization. These values form the basis for the shared belief of the organization's culture. The motto "we're number one" would imply a culture that strives to become the best. Values are critical to the organization striving to create a sense of tone from the CEO to the entire organization. Assumptions are the actual values that the organizational culture represents. They are intrinsic to the environment (Schein). This is the smallest area of the inverted triangle. Schein explains assumptions as the actual values represented by the organizational culture. They are the hardest to recognize.

Edgar H. Schein identified three types of organizational culture. He argues, “When we observe the natural world, what we see, hear, taste, smell, and feel is potentially overwhelming” (189). Organizational members have the same need to make sense of the organization. The types of organizational cultures enable a better understanding the complicated relationship between individual and organization. First is the coercive organization, in which describes the worker as a captive who due to circumstances must obey whatever rules and regulations are imposed. In a culture of coercion communication is diminished and workers function in a sense of alienation. Alienation results in a culture that is not united as each individual is assumed to exit if the opportunity arises.

The second is the utilitarian organization which is summed up by saying a “fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay,” the utilitarian system assumes that workers are economically driven. The third organizational culture is the normative organization which matches the individual’s goals to the organization (Etzioni in Schein, 191). The normative system is assumed to act on a moral level of involvement which enables them to identify with the organization (Schein 191). Each results in a different organizational culture.

The next section will examine the critical approach in response to organizational culture. First Karl Marx as his shaped the critical approach. Second the work of Stanley Deetz is included. There are relationships between the cultural and critical approaches as organizational culture is critiqued. Critical approaches are skeptical of the functionality of culture in an organization. The critical approach views culture as driving the organization and may disagree with the concept of one culture existing in an organization.

Critical Approaches to Culture

The first emergence of critical theory dates back to Victorian times and was a response to the exercise of power of a few people over many people. Critical theory resides in the actionist realm, which responds to societal issues. Issues are often political in nature and respond to the perceived evils of organizational or corporate behaviors (Held in Jablin and Putnam 61). Critical responses are given to structural constraints which do not allow certain actions to occur. One sector uses communication to influence and override another sector in the organization. Critical theorists focusing on communication do not suggest socialization as the most effective means communicating within the organization or hegemonic domination as the complete method (Jablin and Putnam 63).

Society plays an important role in how organizations respond to change. In the 1980s as the economy changed from progressive capitalism to one of “trickle down” economy, organizations began to wield too much power over the individual. Trickle down was the term given to the belief that tax breaks and monies given to corporate organizations would eventually find its way down to the consumer. This proved to be inaccurate and the critical approach to scholarship blossomed during this time in the United States.

This section examines the critical approach to organizational culture. The works of Karl Marx and Stanley Deetz are examined. Feminist critical theory is referenced in the work of Cheris Kramarae and Julia T. Wood.

Karl Marx: Power

Critical approaches critique culture. Critical theory responds negatively to an action or decision that is perceived as unfair or unjust. The critical approach challenges and questions organizational practices. Karl Marx was born on May 5, 1818 in Trier. After studying law at Bonn and in Berlin he turned his interests to philosophy. In 1843 Marx moved to Paris and studied political economy and history. Marx was an editor between 1843 and 1849 at the *Rheinische Zeitung*. Marx wrote *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848. Marx wrote *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848. Marx wrote *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848. His last work written in Hamburg, Germany in 1867 was *Capital : A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1*. Marx was concerned with the conditions of workers in all branches of industry, including women and children (Engels 4). Power society and corporate life is central to Marxist theory. Karl Marx wrote in a time that was marked by brutality in a system of low wages and worker exploitation.

Marxist critical theory is grounded in the works of Karl Marx who responded to unfair balances between business leaders and workers. In Marx's view life was a constant struggle of power over the bourgeoisie and their economic ideals. The power struggle was perpetrated by the division of labor. Karl Marx expressed concern about the exploitation of the worker.

For Karl Marx, labor-power was a struggle between the wealthy business owners and the poor mistreated workers. "The laborer is obliged to sell his labor power to the capitalist because labor power is the only commodity which he has to sell" (Marx in Freedman 48). This was a true concern of Marx when he speaks of labor as the commodity. Marx referred to the "living self" as the only means by which a laborer has a

commodity to sell (*Capital* 43). As in any organization dealing with the selling of tangible goods, raw materials and production is a chief concern.

From this perspective the organization has power over the individual.

Karl Marx suggested that the natural world is not divided into one side with money and commodities and another side with only those who have labor-power. Marx claims the labor-power struggle is the result of many “economical revolutions” which he traces back to social production and the organization (Marx in Freedman 49).

Karl Marx critiqued organizations in which the worker has a tedious task: “Modern Industry indeed, compels society, under penalty of death, to replace the detail-worker of today, crippled by lifelong repetition of one and the same trivial operation” (*Capital* 534). Marx’s critique was focused on the motivation of the individual’s need to earn a wage and the power of the organization that employed the individual. His critique was quite powerful at times as Marx held back little emotion, “we have hitherto considered the tendency to the extension of the working day, the were-wolf’s hunger for surplus-labor” (Marx *Das Kapital* 268). Marx referred to the capitalist organization as a “were-wolf,” powerful and ever-hungry.

In Marx’s historical moment the labor-power dichotomy was unbalanced. Marx sought to balance in favor of the worker. His work generated the scholarly area of critical theory. More current scholarship in critical theory is available in the work of Stanley Deetz.

Stanley Deetz: Corporate Power

Stanley Deetz is a professor of Communication at the University of Colorado. His work addresses both the critical and cultural components of organizations. Following

Karl Marx, power is viewed as a negative force that permeates organizational culture.

“Power is a very messy, controversial concept in the social sciences and especially in the management literature” (Deetz). Power creates a tension or struggle between employees and supervisors.

Stanley Deetz addressed several key factors that impact individuals within an organization. First, individuals identify with the organization on varying levels. These identifiers include, 1) recognition and reward, 2) experience and value, and 3) goals (61). Second when change takes place in an organization it affects the individual as well. Someone has made a decision that impacts the organization and the individuals involved must be responsive to this change. The changes may be fair or unfair. The individual frequently has little, if any, control over these changes.

Power in the organization is also impacted by change. People with more power may feel threatened if their job is threatened and they have worked hard to get to the position they currently hold (Deetz 155). Individuals may feel they are contributing more to the organization when they identify with the role they are given. When they do not feel a connection to their role employees may experience the power struggle, which creates an uncertainty between the individual and the organization. Stanley Deetz explains outcomes programs within organizations as having the potential for a negative affect. Positive outcomes are designed to motivate and encourage employees. Some rewards are monetary, while others may be a simple “pat on the back” (Deetz 123). However, he cautions the use of incentive programs that may promote unethical behaviors or unfair competition that furthers the power imbalance in organizations.

Stanley Deetz also suggests that organizational practices may be discriminatory to certain groups. Some organizational practices are part of their cultural rituals. These rituals solidify the organization's values and goals through a tangible act. Some are unspoken, yet still wield significant power. Deetz views the dangers and benefits of corporate power. Power can be exercised in subtle ways. One example of power may be the norm that working late is rewarded by arriving later the next day, or weekend work is perceived as part of being the "good" employee (Deetz 124). Other examples of power are those individuals being part of the organization's extracurricular activities, softball teams or dinner groups. These may be unrealistic for some employees and may create a negative power struggle of the "privileged" versus the "ordinary" employee. Deetz argues that the single parent may have difficulty with these activities and be looked down upon (124).

This all contributes to the political power that is key to the critical approaches. Stanley Deetz explains that children are programmed to equate "bad" behavior with "bad" people (125). The organization is not different in its evaluation and may actually communicate this through its ethics. Deetz suggests that positive outcomes may be encouraged through leadership. Leaders must feel empowered themselves in order to fairly empower others in the organizations. Critical theorists approach the imbalance of power and the imposition of regulations upon workers that give them little or no room for growth and development. This area continues to be problematic in organizational structures.

This section reviewed the work of Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy who offered a prescriptive approach to organizational culture. The prescriptive approach to

cultural behavior within an organization seeks to explain common values that contribute to organizational success. Edgar H. Schein offered a descriptive approach to organizational culture. In the critical approaches to culture the work of Karl Marx and was reviewed. The next section reviews feminist theorist. Feminist theory for the purpose of this project examines the critical approach to culture from traditional gender bias issues in organizations. The work of Cheris Kramarae and Julia T. Wood is reviewed.

Cheris Kramarae: Muted Group Theory

Cheris Kramarae is a professor and scholar researching from a feminist critical theory vantage on muted group theory. I selected Kramarae because of her works in sociolinguistics and gender studies. Muted group describes the group that cannot be heard and is silenced in some manner. Muted group theory was introduced by Edwin Ardener; however, Kramarae proposes “that women perceive the world differently from men because of women’s and men’s different experiences and activities rooted in the division of labor (Kramarae 3). This approach is integral to organizational studies when considering all work tends to be divided into groups.

Cheris Kramarae posits, “help me make sense of my relationships, and provide a connection of issues in my own life and the world more generally” (55). Organizational culture needs to include everyone in order to have a true culture. Women may have to adjust to the culture that already has been established by traditional male thinking. Organizations foster a team environment which continues to be the preferred method. The teams or groups are able to problem solve and share cross functional tasks. This becomes increasingly important in the context of a global workplace. Cheris Kramarae includes historic relevancy that explains simple imposed society rules. She refers to

transportation as one example. Kramarae encourages reflecting on the “old” feminist work (56). Bicycles were a mode of transportation that women would have been discouraged from using at one time and motorcycles are still considered a man’s transportation. Organizations had historically failed to embrace women or permitted them to have a true voice in the organization.

Muted group theory expresses the lack of voice women had in an organizational context. The division of labor creates many problematic gender issues in an organization when clear parameters and methods of addressing inequities is lacking. In feminist critique and thought a collective decision making process through communication is preferred. This is a process where “all members are empowered to participate; and a collective agreement is reached” (Ollenburger and Moore 203).

The voices must be openly heard and suggestions must be considered in contrast to the exclusion of women’s voices in the muted group theory. Women in the work place who have dealt the traditional call to silence are given the power to engaged in an embedded decision making process. The misconception in feminist theory remains that women suggest a power struggle; however, scholars argue that women in the workplace and society have been seeking power balance (Ferree and Hess 171). The institutions and organizations need to change and in the periods of the 1970s and 1980s they had made considerable progress. Many industries that are male dominated continue to have issues with women in certain positions. Manufacturing is an industry that permits women to move into varying roles; however, excludes women from moving in a focused path towards executive positions.

Julia T. Wood: Direct Power

Julia T. Wood is a communication professor and scholar who researches issues of gender and equality. Her work is timely and relevant to organizations meeting their challenges through adapting communication practices. Wood researches these topics because she believes that society can change. This is also the concern of this project. Her work explains how we are identified by what we are born into as well as what we become (Wood 2). The word feminist is often misconstrued. The word feminine originates from the French “femme” and the suffix of “ist” implies a political stance. The term has been associated with extreme events such as bra burning in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The visual image may include women shouting they are stronger and in extreme cases men are viewed as direct enemies because of their possession of power especially in the Western world (Mor Barak). Wood explains, “Because sex differences-or belief in them-are so woven into cultural life, it is not surprising that they have become a hot topic” (201). Power has been a chief concern in organizational culture in relation to a women’s role in the workplace.

Julia T. Wood’s work connects culture to ideal of power trying to create a culture that work for all people. However, as in an organization when there are competing narratives and varied backgrounds one culture cannot be inclusive of all if it seeks to conform. Feminist theory critiques this push to be controlled and molded by an entity such as organization imposing a culture upon workers that is contrary to their beliefs. This does not indulge the fact when employed by an organization there are codes of ethical behaviors and mission statements to uphold. Moreover, the feminist critique questions the degree of imposing fundamental changes upon their workers or

constituents. Wood explains the term *direct power* as “the ability to make others do what they would not do themselves” (Wood 316). Direct power in an organization is often an executive role or a manager. This is the power that is top down and may come in the form of an order rather a conversation. The power may be unbalanced at times and depending upon the organization the ability a superior has to force a situation may be substantial. Julia T. Wood refers to another type of power termed agenda setting, which may be letters, articles, discussions devised to make something move towards a desired outcome (Wood 316). An agenda may be used for suggesting positive change and exposing unfair work practices. The third process for exercising power is voice. Voice is the communicative action that sends the message. Speaking out against stereotypical remarks to women in the workplace and when injustices arise are two examples Wood expresses (Wood 317). Julia T. Wood’s work is situated in this historic moment and is relevant to the current conditions of the workplace which still remains problematic to feminist equality concerns. As diversity and inclusion within organizations strive to include feminist approaches global issues are a growing concern. Organizations are continually trying to adapt to the changing world which makes the organization’s inclusion practices a valid concern.

Communication is perceived differently in the work of Edgar H. Schein, Terrence Deal and Allan A. Kennedy from a cultural vantage point. Communication varies in each approach to critical theory as well in the works referenced by Karl Marx, Stanley Deetz, Cheris Kramarae, and Julia T. Wood.

Communication in the Cultural-Critical Approach

Culture and communication are intrinsically woven together. One shapes the other within an organization. The enactment of culture serves to communicate meaning. Language is an intrinsic part of culture and every organization uses a language unique to the specific organization. An example may be a children's hospital that would have a language and terminology exclusive to a children hospital's culture. This culture would be very different from a technology based organization that is highly steeped in a culture of electronic communication. Language is intertwined with the identity of the organization and the organization's practices.

Organizations adapt to the culture created and developed over time with responses to daily processes that hold meaning within the organization. This results in using communication as symbols are defined by the particular organization. The symbol may have no meaning to anyone outside of the organization. Communication informs and establishes culture in the organization: "It is such a shared symbolic system which functions in interactions which will here be called a cultural tradition" (Parsons 11). The culture of an organization relies on the social system that supports the communication process.

Communication serves to send messages of value and goals through an organizational system. The cultural system of the organization rests on the integration of communication and organizational norms. Employees do not have the ability to control culture within an organization (Deetz 12). Cultures within an can take on a tribal quality of "sticking together" through ritual acts within an organization. These may be the drinking of coffee in the morning, lunch practices, meeting rules, and other daily tasks that hold a particular meaning.

Edgar Schien argued, “Leadership cannot be separated from culture” (414). I would add that culture cannot be separated from communication. Without solid communication an organizational leadership structure fails. Communication is limited to power within an organization. Communication is directly influenced by these power struggles, and may create a code of silence. There may be issues that are not openly discussed.

Communication traveling through the grapevine may have a negative impact on an organization’s culture of open communication.

Karl Marx viewed communication in terms of freedom. Marx was very vocal concerning the freedom of the press and the disclosure of the truth in all matters (Hardt 85). Although Marx does not write often of communication in his work freedom of speech and of the press was a concern to him. Communication links institutions with people and communication has a power to redeem both the person and the institution (Hardt 87).

Stanley Deetz explained that communication faced many challenges as communication moved from the transmission of messages to the “focus of communication as underlying value and meaning” (107), the role of communication changed within organizations. During the 1970s and 1980s there was an interest in non-verbal and interpersonal communication within organizations. As organizations evolved and began to include a greater diversity of workers, managerial communication needed to change. Workers’ began to represent their competing interests within various institutions (Deetz 109). Corporate social responsibility was driven primarily by the organization for the first time.

Cheris Kramarae explains that women have built informal communication networks in order to develop mutual understanding of culture within an organization. Karamarae states, “there is a great deal of attention paid in development literature to men’s conceptions of communication (46). This leaves women at a distinct disadvantage in the organization. She raises the question concerning women’s ability to be heard in an organization that has a male dominant culture. Language is a tradition and gender represents an integral part of an organization’s communication practices through culture.

Julia T. Wood expresses concerns a need to challenge conventional “moral theories and related sedimented cultural assumptions” (127). Cultural assumptions often discard gender and minority voices in organizations. A critique of culture addresses these attempts to morph all people into one organizational culture that has emerged from traditional white males.

Cultural-critical approaches to organizations emphasized their own sets of rules through mission, vision, and values. Society also imposed government regulations for organizational financial and environmental practices. Society pressured organizations to give back to their communities and organizations took the initiative.

Corporate Social Responsibility

The 1970s through the 1990s created numerous opportunities for social reform and organizational change. Organizations in the 1970s became more aware of the environmental issues facing industry. President Richard M. Nixon led the nation during the close of the Vietnam War. Calls for social responsibility were played out as demonstrations in the streets, on college campuses, and at music festivals. Business was expected to take on a role of greater responsibility.

William C. Fredericks is one of the founders of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the United States. Frederick is a professor at the University of Pittsburgh's Katz School of Business. In his book entitled *Corporation, Be Good! The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility* he discusses the social and ethical responsibilities required of a modern organization. His work includes some of the main concepts that have become the focal points of the CSR field. These include the successive development stages of CSR, the core values of corporate culture, and the global aspect of culture, CSR, along with ethics, social auditing, and the evolution of biology on management decision making (Frederick viii).

In the United States the interest in corporate misdoings dated back around 80 years; however, little research was published in the 1950s and 1960s (Yeager 93). Some of the reasons or low publications may have been lenient laws that caused many crimes to be overlooked. In the 1970's many changes occurred that impacted the social and political climate of the country. Organizations also began to feel the pressures of a country that was experiencing social change at a rapid pace. Race relations were causing many cities to experience periods of demonstrations and unrest. Some of the demonstrations resulted directly from protests of the Vietnam War resulted in pulling troops out and disengagement. The United States was at a turning point and in cultural beliefs about corporate social responsibility remained divided (Yeager 94).

Corruption was taking place at the highest level of government (i.e. Watergate). The attention of the media raised awareness and gave pause to the possibilities of offenses taking place in organizations. The fundamental trust in society shifted and now people became suspicious of the potential for wrongdoing.

Organizations began to address of race, culture, and other diversity concerns in a more structured fashion for this historic period. Many organizations were in the process of merging and aligning with other organizations in this time as well. This created a need for a greater understanding and respect for culture.

Many managers were required to have diversity guidelines in an effort to subdue bias in the workplace. Another guideline induced suggestion was that business should be more involved in civil rights, education, employment and training, and culture and the arts, and social volunteerism. The push was for business to be more than an organization designed to raise profit. The Compliance for Economic Development (CED) declared in 1971 that business should broaden its social horizons (Frederick 48).

The CED was formed as a response to public concerns for corruption. The CED noted greater demands were being made upon business; therefore, business should form a method to address constituency groups. Many practices of CSR were embedded into organizational practices for the first time. Most of these emerged from large corporations. Organizations were dealing men accepting women in non-traditional roles. Black and whites were working together in offices and anti-pollution campaigns were growing in numbers. Organizations sought to include CSR in their own culture through communication practices and social awareness.

Globalization is another significant change that became stronger in the 1980s. President George W. Bush was given credit for introducing “the new world order” (Lechner and Boli 7). This was a time when a global economic environment promised prosperity for business. Technology had ushered in many of the changes that enable business transactions to take place instantly from one area of the globe to the other.

Culture is integral to the rising concern of CSR in organizations. In organizations, the values of those in management positions and all positions of power directly impact the culture of the organization. The trend toward accountability in the business realm became more formal.

In 1983 public confidence in business was 28%. President Ronald Reagan gave a credible boost to CSR. Government regulation was less significant than private business enterprise at this time. The very idea of CSR meant that business had an obligation to act for the social good. This was a move that directly affected corporate culture. The organization that valued CSR embedded the belief within their cultural norms.

The incorporation of CSR into organizations changed the culture. The attentiveness to a greater responsibility connected to the social environment became a cultural value in many organizations. Intrinsically woven into the culture is an awareness of diversity and inclusion within the organization.

Diversity and Inclusion

During the 1970s and 1990s diversity awareness became a part of organizational culture. There are several ways for promoting diversity beneficial and necessary. One is through programming and training employees in appropriate responsibility for diversity. Others include raising an awareness of diversity and using language such as inclusion. Organizational communication practices introduced the use of diversity terminology. Diversity awareness included gender issues such as women in the workplace and minorities in the workplace. The Equal Opportunity Commission generated managerial diversity training stemming from the research by (1998). Acknowledging a practice as wrong did not result in a better means of improving diversity. The evidence pointed to

communication through mentoring and feedback processes that gave an opportunity for interaction as well as question and answer sessions (Kalev, Kelly and Dobbin 590).

Diversity and inclusion are terms frequently used in corporate board rooms. There are cases made for the value of an inclusive workforce. A global society includes a diverse population; however, without a sound moral and ethical imperative for inclusion cultural diversity is reduced to uniformity.

There are benefits to creating sameness through inclusion practices. Historically, the creation of sameness described the white male dominated society in the United States. The world of work in the United States for many decades was white and male, and opportunities were limited for women and people of color. After the Civil Rights and Women's Movement in the 1960s and 1970s organizations began to experience a more diverse workforce. In the 1980s through 2010 we experience a diverse cultural workplace with workers from varying backgrounds, religions, and beliefs. There are numerous obstacles in applying principles that foster inclusion on a global scale (Mor Barak 284). Women became a larger part of the workforce. Feminist approaches to organizational life address issues such as patriarchal language and gender bias. Feminists focus on shared language and a collaborative approach giving credit to the relationships built through communication and teamwork. "Feminist organizations alter traditional networks of authority and hierarchy through shared and revolving leadership" (Stohl 138).

Feminists critique the patriarchal power that refuses to give women a voice. This voice even when spoken may not be heard or interpreted in its intended meaning.

Michalle E. Mor Barak notes, “society emphasizes assertiveness, competition, and material achievements, attributes associated with masculine qualities (173). The feminist approach presupposes a power struggle from the perspective of gender.

Organization are constantly changing and adapting to external and internal developments. Communication is encouraged as part of the act of participation (Stohl 156). Feminist theorists critique the gender issues that impact the organization. Other problematic areas include the “andocentric” gender bias in organizational theory (Jablin 61) critical theory is concerned with the abuse of power. Organizations have been critiqued for their lack of concern for the worker. In examining feminist approaches to critical theory the gender bias is perceived as unfair balance that produces a struggle with the potential of a worker and their needs in the organization.

Historically examining the vocations many women chose from the 1950s to the 1980s the majority of women statistically worked in elementary teaching. This includes minority teachers as well. Postsecondary education in 1980 had an average of 8.12 women as compared to 27.11 males. Elementary education had 60.99 women as compared to 19.72 males (U.S. Census Bureau, 1982). Some may argue that women tend to desire elementary school teaching as compared to men. The opportunities existed for women in post- secondary education at the time.

The end of the Cold War created in many ways a false sense of cultural conflict becoming a thing of the past. Conflict exists as Peter Martin a writer for the Financial Times, “It is profoundly immoral to exclude third-world aspirations merely to preserve the convenience of the pattern of western work” (Martin 19). Diversity is no longer a national issue, it is now a global issues. The critical and cultural approaches were relevant

to the historic moment because the critical approach questioned the “colonization” of corporate America. In examining diversity from another cultural perspective the Islamic media programming has moved from strictly Islamic to include western programming. The government screens political commentary but it has moved to include western exposure. In looking at purely the impact of diversity rather than political issues there is exposure for people who will never experience another culture in any other fashion (Tehrani in Lechner and Boli 359). This is but one example of the impact of exposure to other cultures through communication media.

In a globally diverse organization training and development became critical components that must be addressed on a level of communication that promotes understanding. A process such as a yearly performance appraisal has several factors that must be considered. Misunderstandings run a greater risk of occurring, “without clear communication and understanding of the intent of programs, the opportunities for misinterpretation are significant (Fulkerson and Schuler in Jackson 248). A level of trust between the workers and management must exist in addition to the consumer and the organization. Diversity reaching a global market has to create an inclusive marketplace that speaks to diverse consumers in the period of the late 1980s through 2010 and beyond.

The diversity initiatives in most organizations began to deal with the context of recruitment. After hiring so many minorities for quota purposes organizations began to recognize the talent pool they were able to develop with a more inclusive workforce. The onset of technology brought about many opportunities for organizations to employ and communicate with workers from other countries and cultures. They have to become more

culturally sensitive to the needs of the employees and the customers. This is difficult with the rise of call centers in countries such as India where workers are told to adopt American names and sound American. The inclusion of a culture has the distinct danger of diluting the culture (Dalmage in Gallagher 390). There are policies attempting to close the gap; however, there is much work and research to be done.

Many researchers suggest that the family has to take an active in changing of the biases that exist today concerning race, diversity, and inclusion. The organization cannot do this alone. They may have the role of education within the work environment but there is also the problematic concern of the social environment. Benjamin DeMott, a scholar who writes on contemporary issues with race suggests, “the friendship thesis is the certainty that one-on-one, black-white relations can be relied on to resolve race problems” (DeMott 1995). DeMott argues that interracial relations has the potential for radical change, but in itself it is not enough. The idea that an external relationship has the ability to solve organizational issues is also inaccurate. There needs to exist a balance of the social and organizational awareness of difference in order to create a lasting change that has significant impact in inclusion.

Many diversity and inclusion programs suggest that the constant regulations and changing restrictions placed on organizations have prevented real change. The one size fits all mentality that has been the structure of diversity education no longer works. Each organization is so unique in a global market that it becomes impossible to fit every case. Consistency has always been valued highly in organizational management and this includes a consistence in communication. The individual was not catered to and in many

cases this is impossible in certain work environments. The suggestion of a different management of diversity and inclusion has merit.

Most organizations as in the scientific and classical management era operated out of a model of efficiency. The move promotes one that creates a diversity mindset. Mass production requires the efficiency model; however, working with human beings does not. Creativity and leadership are the two essential components to creating success in a shift to truly diversity oriented and inclusive organizations.

CHAPTER SIX

Case Study: United States Steel Corporation

United States Steel Corporation (USS) has been an integral part of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania history. The United States Steel Corporation is well known in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and surrounding regions. The organization is well known internationally and has a formidable global presence. For over one hundred years the United States Steel Corporation has remained a foundation in the tri-state region. The United States Steel Building can be seen from miles and its shadow announces on the horizon the approach to the city. The building is depicted in nearly every municipal picture or photo of the city of Pittsburgh. The organization broke ground in March 1967 to build the tallest office outside of New York and Chicago. The building consists of 64 stories and rises to 841 feet. Offering “maximum office space and minimizing overall-cost” (Apelt 297). The tower is one of three landmarks comprising the Golden Triangle of commerce in Pittsburgh.

While the building remains a landmark, more important are the employees who sacrifice time, effort, and sometimes their lives for an industry central to the growth of United States’ economy through the last 110 years. The steel industry itself has a long and intriguing history that has roots in Pittsburgh. In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania several labor issues provide a lens from which may be gleaned a clearer understanding of labor relations and organizational communication.

Steel workers were overworked and underpaid. Many workers remained in deplorable working conditions. Pittsburgh was central to several labor issues. Pittsburgh had the Great Railroad Strike in 1877; American Federation of Labor held its first

meeting in Pittsburgh in 1881, the Homestead Strike which was a bloody battle injuring and killing many occurred in 1892. Pittsburgh's Central Labor Union was founded in 1901 and created quite a stir among steel mill managers and laborers.

This chapter will examine USS through the historical lens of organization communication theory. USS was incorporated February 25, 1901. The original corporation in 1901 existed of ten companies: Carnegie Steel Company, Federal Steel Company, American Steel & Wire Company of New Jersey, American Plate Company, American Steel Hoop Company, American Sheet Steel Company, National Tube Company, National Steel Company, American Bridge Company, and Lake Superior Iron Mines. This chapter does not intend to give the interpretation of business getting better in the future. This chapter responds to USS and their engagement in the community which improves an organization's communicative presence.

In examining United States Steel through the years there is an attentiveness that addresses the ethical response to the historical moment. Requisite variety examines an organization's culture through their response to the external environment. This change in culture comes at a high price when the response is merely one of meeting the demands of culture. Joanne Martin argues, "Organizations seek requisite variety because of a need to adapt" (167). When the desire for diversity and integration outweighs the benefit and progresses with no ethical consideration there may be too much integration of culture. The result then becomes the undermining of the current culture than a blending of cultures within the organization.

In the beginning, USS was an idea created by Andrew Carnegie, Charles Schwab, and Elbert H. Gary. The financing expertise of J.P. Morgan and Carnegie's friendship

with Henry Clay Frick solidified the consortium (Apelt 41). This was an historic moment when owning property containing rich coal resources that would be used for coke production created millionaires. The process of steel-making was changing and this group of men had the foresight, and vision to make partnerships with the valuable asset owners. The city of Pittsburgh played a tremendous part in that historic moment as these giant of industry were all from this area or the nearby region.

USS opened as a holding company on April 1, 1901 and began conducting business (Apelt 20). The corporation celebrated its centennial in 2001. The over 100 year span enables an historic analysis of the relation of an organization to society. The organization's communication practices have been instrumental in the continued sustainability of the corporation. These diverse companies were brought together to create an organization that would survive and grow. J.P. Morgan while making money had another more altruistic motive of creating an organization that would share wealth and promote progress (Apelt 50). They communicated at the beginning through the leadership and rhetorical messages of their first CEO.

Elbert H. Gary

The person who was the backbone and "father" of USS was Elbert H. Gary who came to be known as Judge Gary, a title that stayed with him his entire life (Cotter 47). Elbert H. Gary became the first chairman of United States Steel. Gary was born on his a farm in Wheaton, Illinois. His father was a Puritan bringing with him a disciplined view of work. Gary's mother descended from a family who fought for freedom in the Army of Lafayette in France (Cotter 88). Gary remarking on the influences of his life said "My parents. Whatever worthwhile I may have done I owe to their teaching and example" (Cotter 88).

Gary was driven at an early age and when he was eighteen his uncle who practiced law questioned Gary's interest in the profession. Elbert H. Gary joined the firm in 1865 later attending a law school in Chicago. Gary was successful and became Judge of Du Page County in Illinois.

He was later accepted to the bar of the United States Supreme Court setting the stage for his keen problem solving abilities (Cotter 89). In terms of leadership he brought about many innovations and firsts that are practiced in corporations today. The various innovations will be addressed in each section as they are relevant. Leadership between 1880 and the early 1900s the steel industry grew by leaps and bounds.

The early 1900s many steel companies merged to create new companies. During the twenty year span the United States production of iron increased from "4 to 14 million" (Warren 7). The industry was changing rapidly as the demand for steel was strong. During these early years finished iron and steel products were sought after and industry was pressured to produce. Steel finishing came in many varied forms. Bars, plate, sheet tinplate, wires, structural and rails were some of the uses. Railroads themselves required a tremendous amount of steel.

This was a time of revolutionary inventions and developments. By 1901 capacity was an issue which created problematic areas in the production of steel. In 1903 there were higher charges placed on the transport of steel such as rail freight charges from Pittsburgh to Chicago (Warren 22). The Pittsburgh region competed with Lackawanna Steel and Pennsylvania Steel was reorganizing resulting fierce competition among the companies. Ore and coke resources were critical to the demands of producing steel. This

was a time of expansion and growth that often did not give an organization the luxury of time to adjust to changes or communicate them.

With the onset of World War I in 1914 the Allies were dependant on the steel industry. Steel produced guns, ships, tanks and many other tools of warfare. The country was supportive of the industry that enabled the Allied Forces to succeed in their fight. This resulted in a time of unity and support for the industry that was helping to win the war. Between the period of 1914 to 1918 the Steel Corporation produced more than “74 million tons of steel, more than 10 million tons of it shipped to the Allies” (Alpert 109). Other products such as nails and book wire used to bind government publishing products were also manufactured. Another growth product in demand were horseshoes which the organization produced 75,000 kegs, these were the modern necessities of the historic moment.

This was a snapshot of life in the early 1900s war was part of the reality of the day. Steel production was an integral thread in the fabric of daily life.

Elbert H. Gary met J. Pierpoint Morgan while working as general counsel for the Illinois Steel Corporation. There was a merger taking place with Federal Steel Company. Morgan was the financial supporter who was in the new company’s formation. This was the first time the two had met (Cotter 90). Gary was said to be a keen observer who articulated and weighed each word carefully.

Elbert H. Gary’s insights are still followed today in The Gary Principles, a code of ethics and mission statement stating core values of the corporation (Appendix A). In several biographical accounts Gary is said to have asked the question, “Is it right?” when examining business proposals. Most business leaders of Gary’s time were not asking this

question. He was likened to a Boy Scout in his ethical concerns and The Gary Principles have been compared to his version of the Boy Scout Pledge (Apelt 51). Fair play and decency was the motto for Gary's vision of the organization. It is interesting to note that historically the society of the time which was the early 1900s had little patience for what was termed "The Gilded Age Tyrants" referring to the cut throat practices of the captains of industry (Apelt 50).

There was alarm in the United States and Europe when United States Steel was launched as they were accused of attempting to control the world market. Stock was a concern with a fear of failure over an organization simply deemed too large to succeed. Historically the organization did succeed and success was largely due to their attentiveness to the historic moment. United States Steel succeeded in adapting to the changing times instead of ignoring or trying to change them. The world moved and United States Steel moved with it, not in opposition but in tandem. Communication played a significant role in the organization's success. The organization was attacked many times over the last one hundred plus years and responded promptly each time. When change was needed there was an innovation that stayed in step with the demands of workers, society and industry.

Another key figure is Charles M. Schwab who was the first president of the United States Steel Corporation. He was educated in Loretto, Pennsylvania at St. Francis College. Charles Schwab began his career as a draftsman for the Carnegie Company when Carnegie took a liking to him. Schwab's father owned a livery stable where Carnegie staying in his summer home. Schwab was a steel man who was working to solidify Bethlehem Steel in its floundering days (Cotter 102). He and Gary would share

the same vision for the growth of the steel industry. Schwab was in poor health and later did not care for the policies instituted by Gary. Schwab left the industry for a time and returned in 1907. He is reported to have said concerning the formation of United States Steel that “the future will show how well, how securely, its foundations were laid” (Schwab in Cotter 105). This history will serve to set the grounding for the historic examination of each section.

In 1909 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the McKees Rocks Pressed Steel Car Strike was a major event in the local steel industry. The events in Pittsburgh were significant because they tell a story of working conditions in a city of medium size in a time of great production. They tell the story of an organization that has undergone changes from the time of scientific management to present day organizational challenges.

I selected United States Steel Corporation (USS) as my case study because USS has survived over one hundred years and remains a sustainable organization.

The company has adapted in each historical moment to social responsibility, diversity, and inclusion. They have met the challenges and changes through communication processes that have proven successful.

The first section deals with the history of the formation of the organization and the prominent figures with a focus on Elbert H. Gary as the first chairman of the USS. Each consecutive section will examine USS from the following, second, classical management, third, human relations, fourth, systems and human resources, and fifth, cultural and critical approaches to organizational communication.

Classical Management in USS

USS was born in the period of Frederick Taylor's scientific management studies which he conducted at Bethlehem Steel Corporation. The early 1900s was a time of industrial growth and the demand for steel production was high. Innovations were needed in order to keep up with the high demand for steel.

Steel production was rigorous for the worker who was in a back breaking and low wage work in this early stage. In 1911 the president of US Steel was James A. Farrell. As US Steel grew the onset of World War I created an even greater demand for steel and the worker was under pressure to become more efficient and productive. Although in 1913 the United States was engulfed in another depression, the steel industry was making a significant improvement in production by 1914. These were precarious times for society and industry.

Classical management consisted of the work of Frederick Taylor and his theory of scientific management. Taylor's view was focused on task and the worker. Production was important at this time in United States history during the early to mid 1900s. The Industrial Revolution brought about an increase in opportunities for manufacturing. The need for increased production was a true concern. Taylor argued for fair pay for a fair day's work. His coal shoveling experiments at Bethlehem Steel Company in Pennsylvania resulted in a better understanding of employee motivation. The incentives offered to a worker proved that workers could be motivated to increase production. Scientific management did not credit communication as having organizational benefits other than a command and control model related to task orientation and subsequent increased production.

Henri Fayol observed the amount of time wasted through their present communication protocols. These protocols required workers to engage in a structured communication process that was based on organizational hierarchy. Organizations in that historic moment favored a top-down communication structure in order to convey, or share a message with a co-worker. The co-worker may be on the production line with direct access to fellow workers.

Henry Fayol's bridge argued for horizontal communication that moved from worker to worker. This communication process saved considerable time. Fayol's bridge also saved time and effort in crisis situations. Henri Fayol had specific points for managers to follow in organizational processes. As industry continued to flourish and grow theories surfaced that were relevant to organizational operations and function. Function and structure connoted rigidity. Bureaucracy was viewed as a rigid organizational approach that was difficult to navigate for workers.

Max Weber was concerned with poor treatment of workers. He did not want a system of inequality to impact organizational structure and exploit workers. Bureaucracy was originally designed to protect workers. Max Weber was not blind to the dangers of a system that was difficult to navigate and circumvent. Weber believed that bureaucracy was the best system available to institute a policy of fairness within an organizational structure. Communication was command and control style with no consideration afforded the for the worker's voice.

Social responsibility was growing with an interest in issues impacting communities, education, and living, and working conditions. Corporate social

responsibility was not a term that was used in organizations in that historical moment. Diversity and inclusion were not true organizational concerns in the early to mid-1900s. The general feeling of American society toward WWI was rather distant. Considering that the war began in the Balkins when a Serbian gunman, Gavriilo Princip acting on his own accord, shot and killed Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary and his wife in 1914. This was a war that made the central powers choose sides. The Axis powers included Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire. The Allied powers included Great Britain, Italy, France, and the United States. President Woodrow Wilson requested that Americans detach themselves, stating, “remain impartial in actions as well as in name” (Wilson in Apelt 90). By 1917 USS production had reached \$179 million.

The economy was not stable and the impact of Europe’s feud had created a war taking men away from their families and many never returned. US Steel had lost earnings nearly half of the previous \$141.4 million earned a decade earlier. The organization supported the workers by maintaining their wages and providing something which supported the environment. They provided garden space for workers to grow food for their families. USS was sympathetic to the economic situation many families were facing at this time (Apelt 91).

History would give us the sinking of the British ship, the Lusitania on May 7, 1915 by a German submarine. The number of Americans killed was reported at 130 people or more. On April 2, 1917 a declaration of war was requested by President Wilson. The move toward the patriotic took over the country. USS was an integral part of the effort. Judge Gary was appointment by the United States Government to lead the iron

and steel industry in the war effort. USS was responsive to the social undercurrents of war emerged through symbolic communication. Posters, pamphlets, and radio broadcasts communicated the call for all Americans to come together to aid the war effort.

Although the government previously opposed a huge steel merger because of the potential of a monopoly, the government now viewed steel as essential to the war effort. USS was shipping steel to the Allies before the United States was actively involved in WWI. In concert with classical management theory, the workers at the Homestead Works in Pennsylvania were given a production increase to meet. The Pittsburgh and tri-state region was integral to the making of steel and its various by products. The Homestead Works was later called the Liberty Mill due to the war efforts made by workers to increase steel production to meet demand and help win WWI. The workers built a brand new 110 inch plate mill in six months (Apelt 94) setting new production records.

Two important components unfolded related to classical management theory. First, production increased through incentives; aside from pay there existed a common goal. Workers had a common enemy to fight. There was a motivation in place to produce what was required but to also go beyond the minimum expectations of one's supervisor. William Serrin, a biographer of the time stated, "the men worked so hard and put in such long hours that they had to be admonished to stop working and were sent home" (Serrin 75). Second, efforts to better communicate were incorporated. Fayol's Bridge to communicate on a lateral plane rather than top down was effective. The message was clear and was heard and understood by the workers.

USS through increasing its production also invested in the organization. They improved plants and working conditions. The company built housing for the growing

employees coming to work for USS. The company gave several of its ships to the government for use in the war effort. USS purchased bonds called Liberty Loan Bonds and allotted \$24 million worth of bonds for their employees. Many employees made the decision to enlist in the military because of their sense of duty. This was a difficult period for those abroad and those who remained at home. United States instituted a policy that was rather unique for its time. On June 20, 1916 the USS Finance Committee agreed to extend pay to all employees and their subsidiaries whom were at war. Corporate social responsibility was not a term used in the early 1900s; however, social responsibility was a growing concern. USS was responsive to the social demands of corporations showing support for the families of those fighting overseas in WWI. The employees would be re-employed upon their return if conditions permitted (Apelt 97). The war was a time of devastation as USS lost several workers, in high offices and laborers due to their service in military during WWI.

A labor shortage was occurring with all of the enlisted men and the steel companies were recruiting African American men to fill job shortages. There was a migration of African Americans from the southern United States to the North to fill industrial positions. In August 1917 over 4,000 African Americans worked at the Carnegie plants in Pittsburgh (Apelt 99). USS purchased a property that served as a community center for the migrating workers. Life was difficult. The majority of the jobs for African Americans were in jobs where the labor was intense and difficult. The living conditions were poor and sparse. As the steel industry continued to grow the wages of steel workers grew as well.

This improved wage brought many people to desire work in the mills. Foreman were encouraged to accept and embrace foreign workers, because they had shown their loyalty to the company. This was a move toward social responsibility, diversity and inclusion at a time when the words were not used and no laws of hiring were firmly in place. People were brought and accepted out of need and a common bond brought about by a country at war. The total earnings of USS by the end of war had been estimated at 1 billion dollars (Warren).

During the war, USS gave up to two and one half times pay increases for workers including African American men, and foreign born laborers. This also enlightened workers who realized their value to the steel company. The organization felt they had helped the war effort and they went the extra mile in proving themselves socially responsible by helping to build the failing economy. This attitudinal shift would change the worker. Workers no longer wanted incentives based on production alone, they sought more. These changes in the worker exemplify the Hawthorne Studies which through Elton Mayo's work concluded that workers were motivated by acknowledgement and recognition (17). Worker's had some time to reflect on the aspects of working that held a value other than monetary. The war was over so the workers had time to consider their options. They were respected by the public for their service as well. Society viewed them as heroes of sorts. Social changes began to emerge that would dramatically change the face of organizations.

The formation of unions caused some extreme conclusions to be drawn. In 1919 when the Seattle ship yard workers went on strike, then later 120,000 textile workers followed suit business and government blamed the Bolsheviks (later known as

Communists) for influencing workers (Apelt 101). The country had come out of a global war, many Russian immigrants were in the country working, and communism was feared. There were mass arrests at organizations where demonstrations took place. After some deliberation USS workers favored an open shop. This meant that the workers had the right and choice to join the union or not to join. Elbert H. Gary felt that USS provided so many benefits in the way of pensions and wages the workers felt that the union could not offer them much better (Cotter). USS built homes for their workers to purchase at affordable rates, they provided excellent hospital care, and began a program entitled “Safety First” that remains in place.

Regarding the strike of 1919 Gary commented, “We never resent unfavorable criticism from any source concerning our attitude toward employees, if made in good faith, even it may not be deserved” (Gary in Apelt 101). Gary was not one to shy away from communication. When negative comments were made his response was not to go on the defensive but rather to stay the course with facts. His communication was fluid and adapted to the changing questions and times.

The Human Relations Approach in USS

During the late 1920s and 1930s employees began to gain momentum in the steel industry and other industries as their value was recognized by the workers and their organizations. Pittsburgh was on the forefront of most processes in the steel industry. On such process used at USS was the Pittsburgh-plus, a century old billing method popular in the steel industry. Pittsburgh had an advantage over its competitors because coal and ore was so abundant in the region. The cost of transporting steel Pittsburgh was added to the bill as it was most cost effective to produce the steel in the region (Apelt).

Historically, many events had taken place. The steel industry has survived the Great Depression and the country by the end of the 1930s was on the brink of World War II. Change had come again and United States Steel faced changes on its own. The war had earned the steel industry almost \$190 billion dollars (Apelt 170). Over one third of the products were manufactured by United States Steel.

The chairman of USS during the late 1930s was now Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. He was the youngest chairman in their history and he brought many new fresh ideas to the business world. This new thinking went in step with the human relations approach that gave the employees more consideration by paying attention to them as in the motivation studies of Elton Mayo. The Social Security Act was supported by United States Steel and Stettinius made reference to supporting the “socially minded employees” (Apelt 172). This was a historic time of salaried employees questioning pensions, benefits and dividends paid to stockholders. There was more of a communicative dialogue emerging that would not permit excluding stake holders from the conversation. President Roosevelt was in office now and dealing with an impending war. In May of 1940 Roosevelt called Stettinius to take a position on the council of the Council for National Defense. Stettinius departed USS with an official letter of resignation. WWII began with the attack on Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941. More men would be leaving the American workforce and the steel industry would again have production demands.

A significant turn at this historic moment of the 1940s involved diversity as women enter the workforce. Women were in traditional roles as mothers, wives and homemakers. The external working women would not have been in the mill setting. The World War II changed that as so many were called off to fight the women were available

to fill the gaps. “A lot of women took a lot of the men’s jobs (Rose Kranz, a worker in Apelt 179). The Pittsburgh region produced many steel families.

These were families who owed their livelihood to generations of steel workers. War bonded people as Rose Kranz remembered, “People were different during the war. People helped one another. They done the job as good as it could be done, and there were no arguments” (Kranz in Apelt 180). WWII created a need to communicate to complete a much needed job. Elton Mayo suggested that a task or crisis produces a willingness to communicate regardless of opinion. Mayo argued workplace norms affect organizational communication and culture (12). Again the steel industry pulled our nation together in order to fight a war. By the end of the war, V-E (Victory in Europe) day May 7, 1945 steel and society had undergone several changes.

Human relations had brought more recognition to employees and women had been integrated into the workforce. Unions had formed and labor was organized. The worker was no longer merely taking orders from above. Communication was not only top down in a typical command and control model.

USS has continued to use the top down when necessary. Their motto is safety first and there are several industrial situations that require this mode of communicating. USS did not discount communicating in this fashion because other theorists emerged with better communication practices. USS integrated the top-down approach to be utilized in dangerous areas where industrial accidents were of substantial concern. The labor unions brought about a type of negotiation which required a dialogue on the part of the organization as well as the workers.

Chester I. Barnard's work brought greater awareness to communication in the organization. Barnard was concerned with the executives in an organization clearly defining the goals and expectations of the workers. USS through leaders such as Elbert H. Gary who instituted the Gary Principles as a code for guidance patterned Barnard's suggestions. Workers wanted to be acknowledged.

Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne Studies were responsible for research that resulted in understanding the worker. Elton Mayo engaged in the various experiments that were conducted through illumination, observation and group pressure workers were found to enjoy the attention they were given. Workers felt they were acknowledged and given attention. This led them to a greater motivation toward their work. These studies were referred to as the Hawthorne Studies. During the time of the studies USS was offering various programs to workers including them in some of the decision making progress that directly impacted their work. In 1941 the government requested the aid of the steel industry and through employee inclusion USS met this request by "building new furnaces, rolling mills, and finishing equipment" (Warren 195).

The System and Human Resources Approach in USS

This period of history from the late 1950s to the late 1960s is one of tremendous and rapid change at USS and in organizational development and communication. At some points the pace seems to advance too quickly for American society to grasp the benefits and consequences of change. In the steel industry, 1959 was the first time that more steel was imported than exported. This was monumental for a nation that produced the majority of the world's steel. This occurred due a national labor strike that began when labor union's general counsel, Arthur J. Goldberg requested a major wage increases

for steel workers. This was precipitated by the announcement of high profits for the steel industry overall. Labor was changing and believed the profit should result in a greater wages for workers. The conflict was responsible for an unprecedented national strike lasting 116 days. The strike ended when President Eisenhower forced the parties to reach a settlement by using the Taft-Hartley Act which had a back to work provision. This strike ultimately hurt the steel industry as steel was imported in order to meet the demands for steel in a national crisis (Herling).

The organizational system is impacted by the external environment. In examining the Gary Principles USS addressed concerns of the external environment. Elbert H. Gary expressed in his principles, “I believe thoroughly in publicity. The surest and wisest of all regulation is public opinion” (Appendix A). The external public and its practices impact an organization. Human resource managers develop many best practices based on external sources. The human resource theory was a management system that adapted to a system of employee development. The work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Karl Weick, and Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn was explored in systems theory. Human resource theory examines the work of Rensis Likert, Leonard Nadler, and Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton’s managerial grid. Communication was more concerned with the voices of the individual worker in the organization. Theorists such as Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg suggested that an individual’s basic needs had to be met before they could seek a higher level of fulfillment. Maslow referred this stage as self-actualization (95). Hertzberg was concerned with an individual’s motivation to work. Organizations were hiring a more educated workforce that sought more than wages based only on production as in the days of scientific management.

Management saw the need to understand and communicate more effectively with the workers. USS was experiences these changes as well. Workers were not only taking orders; moreover, they were responding to suggestions when feasible. A valuable method for matching managerial styles during this time was Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton's managerial grid. USS utilized the human resource best practices for employee development. USS also used best practices in their steel production.

Communication shifted in open systems theory from individual to relational (Rogers). The organizational structure was attentive to external influences and adapted in order to innovate. USS was an open system organization as they responded and remained attentive to external societal changes. Communication became more an integral part of human behavior within an organization. Human resource management viewed communication as part of the manager's role. Employees were addressed as part of a team. Performance and development of the employee became a concern to the organization. Workers were realizing their value and communicated this message to the organization. The organization was required to adapt to remain viable and retain talent. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) began to grow gradually raising and awareness within organizational structures. Workplace diversity became part of an organization's CSR strategy. There are significant differences, "workforce diversity is not about anthropological differences between people that make them special" (Mor Barak 122). This was apparent in open systems as organizations responded to external changes and pressures. Public mistrust had negative influence on organizations. Diversity and inclusion began to fain in awareness and legal requirements for organizations. The integration of African Americans and women proved to be challenging and

communication was means to accomplish diversity initiatives. In diversity issues at USS there is a connection to the core mission and Gary Principles. Elbert H. Gary called for open transparency in all corporate dealings. Gary argued, “We must keep ourselves on a platform so fair, so high, so reasonable, that we will attract the attention and invite approval” (Appendix A). CSR hailed an implicate call for transparency that has not always been heeded. In looking to the ethical implications of an organization of the size of USS transparency becomes a daunting and deliberate task that communication supports and fosters through message and deed.

Producers of foreign steel were paying lower wages to workers which reduced the price of foreign steel. On the economic front inflation was growing and lighter gauges of steel were causing a shift toward other materials. Personal consumption of smaller goods were in greater demand (Apelt 245). Manufacturing workers began to see that their expertise merited wages equal to those of the steel industry.

During the Late 1950s human resource departments emerged in companies to manage the people end of the business. They provided an overseeing of benefits, wages, regulations and other issues. They began to see the need to the development of people within an organization. The systems with the steel organization are open for the most part as United States Steel was impacted directly by the external environment. The system responded to social change and was forced to change in order to remain competitive in a fast paced world. Steel responded to the demands of war with increased production. When there was not sufficient labor to compete with the demands the system sought foreign born workers and women for the first time (Cobble).

These are all changes that were brought about from the external pull of societal change. USS responded rather than fighting to maintain a status quo or to stagnate (Warren). Problematic issues were on the rise and Japan was becoming an increasingly fierce competitor. Japan could inexpensively purchase scrap steel and transport it from the West Coast to their mills. This was the beginning of the end for many steel workers who deliberated over the best course of action. The Japanese were using our steel to undercut our domestic products. The American steel workers wage was on average seven times that of the steel workers in foreign countries. The problem was serious.

President John F. Kennedy was in office and his battle was inflation. The executives at USS were not helping the situation. Kennedy was furious with Roger Blough the chairman of USS at this time 1962. They were planning to raise steel prices when Kennedy had asked them not to do so. Kennedy was so furious that he blackballed the steel manufacturer and had the FBI subpoena USS executive's personal records (Apelt 278). This was historically remembered as the time the most government forces were used against an American company. The battle continued as the cause of inflation was debated. In the end United States Steel was able to save American jobs. The prices of steel increased; however, money was placed in research that was used to keep foreign steel at bay. The prices went down after a time. The average worker was not concerned with steel prices as much as they were concerned with the rising costs in their everyday lives. This involved everything from groceries to mortgages. The workers faced other challenges. They were working in an ever increasing industry engulfed in regulations, declining demand, and negotiations in order to stay afloat.

Cultural-Critical Approaches in The United States Steel Corporation

Critical approach scholars such as Karl Marx and Stanley Deetz would find several faults with an organization of this size related to its size and power and control rests in the critique of an organization this size. Individuals are seen as being controlled by powerful organizational leaders.

Two critical areas are present in USS and the traditional steel company. The management versus the union is one such view. This would be a power and control situation. Stanley Deetz argues against in his term “corporate colonization” and the control through media and education of our view of the organization (Deetz 17). Resistance to corporate control is a form of activism in which workers and members of a community may engage in order to resist supervisory control. Corporation’s leaders do in fact communicate messages and impact our lives.

In the critical approach USS has implemented several policies that enable an employee to integrate without being in a power struggle with their organization. One such process is USS’s Code of Ethical Behavior. This code has been adapted and modified to fit the historic moment and address current concerns. The Code dates back to the original Gary Principles which is one significant reason the organization continues to succeed through trials and changes. The Code is the part of the original mission of the organization and adheres to the ethical principles set forth by Judge Elbert H. Gary in the beginning. Although USS is not a perfect organization the code gives the organization a common ground from which to begin. This code is a rhetorical and communicative symbol as it connects the organization culturally to their beliefs (Schein).

Employees are asked to commit to the safety first motto and take this very seriously. The sense of responsibility for one another as well as the organization is apparent. The employees are asked to question processes and procedures including unethical practices and improper customer relations as long as they follow the code when doing so. In the critical approach this may be construed as another exercise; however, I argue this a grounded means from which to communicate a concern with valid support.

Culturally the organization is driven by a culture of safety and responsibility that enables employees to remain an individual within a culture that again follows a mission and code. The culture has committed to the original principles through the common grounded knowledge of the organization and its collective history. This is critical to fostering a culture that is based on working towards a common goal. The culture is not based on comprising for the sake of comprise. The culture of USS is comprised of employees from a variety of professional jobs from laborer to engineer, to executive. They are all accountable to their cultural norms and code of conduct. Their mantra is “know the right thing to do” this applies directly to their cultural accepted codes of ethical behavior and conduct and cannot be separated apart from the other concerns of industry (Apelt). People are held accountable but not in a power and control fashion. They are held accountable by a cultural communicative code of what is right and wrong in their environment.

Communication in USS

Brainpower was beginning to take the place of manpower when making decisions in the steel industry. The demand for steel waivered post wartime news ideas had to come from the people who worked in steel. United States Steel also had to make a fresh name

for itself. Communication aided this effort with the production of The United States Steel Hour by John Sutherland Productions, Inc. (Apelt 244). Originally a radio program the USS Hour was a television spot that sponsored dramatic shows while allowing the USS name to become a household word. This became a cultural symbol within and external to the organization (Schein). This showcased other products that the industry was making in order to keep consumers interested in steel production. The Mackinac Bridge was built by USS and American Bridge. This bridge became a symbol that communicated the power and tradition of USS to its employees, competitors and consumers. This bridge became the world's longest suspension bridge at the time it was built. The bridge connected Michigan's peninsula to the rest of the state. People needed to learn how steel had become an integral part of their everyday lives. Communication in classical management theory was command and control style. The messages came from the top management down to the subordinates. There was no voice for a worker within this approach to organizational functioning. Henri Fayol's bridge was the one area that communication developed to a place of worker to co- worker communication. The bridge was perceived as valuable in that time was saved so the intrinsic value remained connected to the rate of production. This process was reserved for certain situations. Communication in that historic moment was restrictive in organizations. Communication was hierarchical and used primarily to give orders from superior to subordinate.

Communication through symbol was a means to accomplish this. Their cars were made of steel, and many house hold products. Workers felt a part of this entire revolution toward building American toys and leisure products rather than just war tools. History shows us an industrious time when many inventions were on the rise. Collaboration

existed between community and organization. Workers were more instrumental in their working conditions and benefits. The door of communication had been opened.

Corporate Social Responsibility in USS

USS has been social responsible historically. The rules and law that now encompass Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) have emerged over time with the introduction of Sarbanes-Oxley. The steel industry has the propensity for being hard on the environment and communities around the plants. Several protections have been put into place over the years. USS began supporting workers in the 1920s and 1930s through their Victory Garden which gave employees a place to plant vegetables for their families during hard times. The organization provided housing that was new and affordable. They supported men at war by continuing their wages and holding positions open when possible upon their return. They supported hospitals and medical care (Apelt 78). There are other concerns. The code states that a code cannot possibly encompass all issues. The code provides a ground from which to start. The Socratic Method is also used. There are several questions the employee must ask themselves. An example of one is “will do harm” if the questions are reflected upon in a difficult situation an employee should be able to come to the right decision through discernment. Because of the many engineers employed by United States Steel the Engineering Code of Ethics is also part of the decision making process for those in the engineering field.

United States Steel has several codes in place that meet and exceed the regulations for environmental issues. There is the removal of waste materials, chemicals and reporting accurate levels of toxins at times. The policies in place have been instituted by law with considerable fines if not adhered to; however, the employee programs and

examples support the process so that the question of production in favor of short cuts is not a question to consider. The culture of the organization has instilled safety and environmental concerns into their employees understanding of the importance of protecting the environment. This is accomplished through education and communication. One of the recent initiatives is sustainable steel which has an extensive education program. United States Steel employs over 50 thousand people who live in communities impacted by many of the new processes in the steel industry. The community involvement gives workers a direct stake in their daily lives as community members with avid concerns.

Diversity and Inclusion in USS

United States Steel has incorporated diversity, employing African Americans, foreign born workers, and women into the steel industry. This practice began during the First World War long before regulations and laws were in place. Women comprised a significant part of the labor pool in World War II and many continued to work in laboring jobs. While the industry needed the worker; the organization also saw value in each worker. Today USS has an extensive diversity policy in place. In 2006 USS established a diversity council made up of people from several backgrounds. The purpose was to establish policies that were inclusion and engaged all people. Their chairman and CEO John Surma suggested a more diverse population increases the talent pool of the organization by integrating the best people for the job (www.uss.com/diveristy). United States Steel has published several articles and pamphlets that address various diversity issues.

United States Steel has a society for women engineers, black engineers, and have been in many diversity events. They have sent women to professional development programs and continue to support their growth through mentoring programs. Diversity has become of the communication projects of the organization. They have been in Diversity Matters and participate in CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) of Allegheny County. CASA is a volunteer supported organization that helps abused and neglected children of all races. United States Steel has been a dedicated supported over the years through both monetary donations, resources, and volunteering employee's time and talent.

During classical management years, 1900 to the late 1920s, USS promoted a top down command and control approach. This approach is still relevant in situations that are life threatening, or create a serious safety issue. Critical organizations, such as the military, nuclear power plants, and organizations where process and procedure leaves no room for error or discussion benefit from the top down communication approach. However, even in organizations where safety is a serious concern there has been a communicative move toward the human side of communicating. There is communicative adaptation. The ability for an organization to integrate each of these approaches when necessary supports USS's approach to organizational communication. There is no right or wrong organizational communication process. The approach from classical to cultural is dependent on the workers, the situation, the level of danger, and the need for various communication processes. This communicative move grounds us in conversation and human discourse. As Martin Buber expressed, "a turn toward the other" (Buber 15). This

turning toward the other provides a place for authentic communication from leader to manager to subordinate.

The human relations approach the experiments of Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne Studies shed light upon the need for workers in an organization to have a purpose which motivates them.

As this project moved through the Systems and Human Resource Approach communication became more apparent in that organizations in open systems were greatly influenced by their external environment. United States Steel was an excellent study of an organization impacted by two World Wars, the Great Depression, labor unions, several presidential changes, political agendas and a declining steel economy. These are only touch the tip of the external factors involved. United States Steel communicated their message to the employees and the public through various means.

John Surma is USS's current CEO. Mr. Surma explained that as long "as long as the organization adheres and remains authentic to the Gary Principles individuals cannot go wrong. The ethical principle is deeply embedded in the culture" (Surma, September 8, 2010).

D. John Armstrong was United States Steel's public relations executive vice president during their centennial. He retired in 2003 the desire to communicative authentically was reiterated. D. John Armstrong was working at United States Steel during their centennial. Armstrong reiterated the importance of communicating authentically. "Communication was vital. I had to address issues as soon as they occurred. United States Steel wanted to maintain honest and transparent communication" (Armstrong, July 8, 2010).

Press releases and the news media were always in the forefront of wanting information on the organization. United States Steel controlled the media when the company launched the “US Steel Hour” which aired on television weekly. The organization did not shun communication; moreover, they embraced an opportunity for the sharing of information.

As any organization power and control exist to some degree and cannot be removed from the equation. United States Steel has given employees a “Code of Ethical Behaviors” that holds in place a methodology for voicing concerns. They have a choice in doing what is right. The culture is one that is tightly bound. In my experience there is an element of trust that must be earned in order to enter the organization as an outsider.

The culture is steeped in their mission of safety first and fair treatment of others. USS has survived for over 100 years, undergoing significant changes during that time. In every historic moment they have remained faithful to their code of ethics. This was and continues to be grounded in the Gary Principles. These principles are communicated in writing, verbally and in their ethical code. The communicative move is one of additive change. They did not eliminate processes and procedures that were in place for the protection and safety of everyone. USS adapted to each historic moment and to each societal change.

The coming together of various races and cultures within an organization was still a new concept. Immigration brought many ethnic groups together in the United States. Many African Americans and women entered the workforce due to the increasing need for workers and the lack of white men due to war. There were groups such as the Eugenics who were concerned with racial blending and they sought ways to prevent

immigration. Inclusion is the action of bringing others into the organization and creating an environment of welcome and participation. This was not yet a concept.

Conclusion

United States Steel has been a sustainable organization in a volatile, and historically significant industry. The steel industry has had to respond to various changes due to war, economic developments, automobile production, and national defense. While they are an industry that was intrinsic to scientific management and production they also remained attentive to change. Through additive change USS was able to respond to external challenges. In systems theory Ludwig von Bertalanffy suggested that “everything in nature is a system” that relies on another component (37). There is a very holistic approach to systems in his view. USS was able as an organization was able to incorporate changes through communication practices that permitted a rhetorical responsiveness to external concerns in society.

Although USS’s response was in actions that the organization participated in they directly impacted their external environment. Human relations approaches focused heavily on the research that emerged through the Hawthorne Studies. Elton Mayo’s work brought to light the need for acknowledging the worker. The lighting experiments simply gave the workers a sense of motivation from being recognized in their daily work-related tasks. Charles W. Redding was a scholar who brought communication to a discipline of its own. His work made organizations such as USS consider the benefits of communicating better with employees and stakeholders.

The critical and cultural approaches were historically applied as the trends in society and organizational communication and structure progressed. The period created

opportunities for many minorities and women; however, the over powering influence of corporate America was a concern. USS had symbolic cultural iconic communication pieces. They have a logo which Edgar Schein argues is a culturally bound organizational artifact. The USX Tower is another example of a symbolically, culturally communicated object.

The intense developmental growth of the corporate organization through media and advertising had a very direct cultural impact on society. As society continued to progress and organizations adapted to external demands in consumer needs the ethical dimension was problematic. All of these developments brought about a deeper expectation of ethical and corporate social responsible behavior on the part of organizations.

Ethical lines that should remain black and right in the context of right and wrong were graying. The corporate development of social responsibility added more regulations in the form of economic and environmental government regulations. This chapter examined the cultural approach to organizational communication through the work of Terrance E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy, and Edgar H. Schein. Their work has contributed immensely to the study of culture within an organizational environment. Deal and Kennedy work from the prescriptive approach and Schein from the descriptive approach. Each approach considered culture to be a critical component in organizational life and communication.

The critical approach was examined from the work of Karl Marx and Stanley Deetz. Marx was seminal in the historic appearance of critical theory which critiques culture. Deetz was a contemporary perspective of critical approaches to organizational

communication. The incorporation of the feminist perspective in the critical approach was included in the work of Julia T. Wood and Cheris Kramarae. Their work was representative of the inclusion of women in a greater role in the workplace. Issues of voice and inclusion were significant to the development of organizational communication.

Communication was examined in each approach and the contribution each approach has made to the understanding of organizational communication. Social responsibility was looked at from that historic moment. Corporate social responsibility was born in this period of rapid change and concern with the obligation of business to society. Diversity and inclusion was examined from growing changes. These changes dealt with the emerging need to blend several types and styles of workers into one organization while still permitting each to maintain their unique identities. These approaches and theories move us to the impact of history on the postmodern organization. A successful organization in the current historical moment developed from a rich and diverse history that remained attention to authentic leadership and subtle changes in society and organizational development. Communication that is authentic and remains connected to the original mission and values remains a key component of sustainability and growth in changing times.

Communication was sought to be authentic, understood, clarified. The organization met the test of time and because of its longevity and reputation fit in very with my project. I would suggest an organization remain true to its mission. The code that binds grounds the organization's communication processes. The success of the future sustainability of an organization lies in the process of additive change. Further research in

organizational history must continue unfold as it unveils the connection permitting the communicative move to remain always attentive to the historic moment. In a world that is global and increasingly more technological communication must remain adaptive. The historic moment may require organizations and individuals to rely on various modes of communication. There must always remain at the core of communication practices. Communication is a human process that requires authenticity, acknowledgement, and respect for the individual in the historic moment.

Work Cited

- Apelt, Brian. *The Corporation: A Centennial Biography of United States Steel Corporation 1901-2000*. Pittsburgh: Cathedral Publishing, 2000.
50, 51, 78, 91, 97, 94, 99, 101, 111, 170, 172, 179, 180. Print.
- Armstrong, John D. Interview. July 8, 2010.
- Arnett, Ronald C., Fritz Harden, Janie M. and Leanne M. Bell. *Communication Ethics Literacy. Dialogue and Difference*. Los Angeles: Sage Publishing, 2009. 77. Print.
- Arnett, Ronald C. and Pat Arneson. *Dialogic Civility in a Cynical Age. Community, Hope, and Interpersonal Relationships*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1999. 303. Print.
- Anshen, Melvin. *Managing the Socially Responsible Corporation*. New York: McMillan Publishing, 1974. 4. Print.
- Barnard, Chester. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967. 33, 38. Print.
- Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming a Leader*. Cambridge: Perseus Books Group, 2003
xv, 39. Print.
- Bernard, Luther Lee. *The Transition to an Objective Standard of Social Control*. Chicago: Kessinger Publishing, 1911. Reprint 2010. Print.
- Blake, Robert and Mouton, Jane S. "The Managerial Grid : Applied Behavioral Science of the Study of Management." *Thinkers*. New York: Chartered Management Institute, 2002. Print.

Bauer, R.A. *The Corporate and Social Audit*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.
Print.

Briscoe, Benjamin. "New York Times." Feb. 15. 1911. 15. Print.

Buber, Martin. *Between Man and Man*. London: Routledge, 1947. 6, 15, 25, 29. Print.

Buzzanell, Patricia M. and Stohl, Cynthia. "The Redding Tradition of Organizational
Communication on Scholarship. W. Charles Redding and His Legacy."
Communication Studies. Central States Communication Association, July 2005. HTML.

Carnevale, Anthony Patrick and Stone, Susan Carol. *The American Mosaic: An in Depth
Report On the Future of Diversity at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers,
2005. 17. Print.

Carr, Adrian. *Work and Organization: The Aesthetic Dimension*. ISCE Publishing,
2009. Print.

Carr, Albert. "Is Business Bluffing Ethical?" *Harvard Business Review*. Vol.46
January, February. 1968. 143-53. Print.

Coffin, Judith G. and Robert C. Stacey. *Western Civilizations*. Sixteenth ed. New
York: W.W. Norton Publishers, 2008. 730-731. Print.

Connerley, Mary L. and Paul B. Pedersen. *Leadership in a Diverse Multicultural
Environment. Developing Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills*. San Francisco
Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005. ix, 4. 5. 23. Print.

Cotter, Arundel. *United States Steel: A Corporation with Soul*. New York: Doubleday,
1921. 47 88, 89, Print.

Crane, Verner W. *Autobiography*. New York: Harper, 1956. Print.

Culbertson, Hugh M. and Chen, Ni. *International Public Relations: A Comparative*

- Analysis*. Boston: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 1996. 75. Print.
- “Corporate” Oxford English Dictionary. 162. Print.
- Davenport, Charles Benedict. *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2010. Print.
- Deetz, Stanley A. *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1992. 155, 124, 125, 123. Print
- Deal, Terrance E. and Kennedy Allan A. *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. New York: Basic Books, 1984. 22 28. Print.
- DeMott, Benjamin. *The Trouble with Friendship: Why Americans Can’t Think Straight About Race*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Elfstrom, Gerard. *Ethics for a Shrinking World*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1990. 83. Print.
- Engels, Friedrich. *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2009. 4. Print.
- Etzioni, Amitai. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964. 21. Print.
- Etzioni, Amitai. “A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations.” *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Schein, Edgar H. New York: Jossey Bass, 1991. Print.
- Fayol, Henri. *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman and Sons Ltd., 1949. Print. 19.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, Judith Lorber and Beth B. Hess eds. *Revisioning Gender*. Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2000. 171. Print.
- Ferguson, Kathy. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple

- University Press, 1984. Print.
- Frederick, William, C. *Corporation Be Good! The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Indianapolis: Dog Ear Publishing, 2006. 6, 7, 8, 13, 48, 51. Print.
- Freedman, Robert. *Marx on Economics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962. Print.
- Freidman, Thomas. *The World is Flat 3.0: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Picador, 2007. 12, 28. Print.
- Fulkerson, John R. and Randall S. Schuler. "Managing Worldwide Diversity at Pepsi Cola International" Susan Jackson ed. *Diversity in the Workplace: Human Resource Initiatives*. New York: Guilford Press, 248. Print.
- Gallagher, Charles. *Rethinking the Color Line: Readings in Race and Ethnicity*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1999. 390. Print.
- Gallos, Joan V. ed. *Organizational Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006. 48-49. Print.
- Garriga E. and Melee, D. "Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping and Territory" *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2004. 51-53. Print.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Culture (Basic Book Classics)*. New York: Basic Books, 145. 1977. Print.
- Gerth and Mills. (trans.and ed). *From Max Weber*. New York: 1946. 938. Print.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1984. ix. Print.
- Gilbreth, Frank. B. *Primer for Scientific Management*. New York: Forgotten Books, 2010. Print.
- Grunig, James, E. *A New Measure of Public Opinions on Corporate Social*

- Responsibility. The Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 22. No. 4. 741. Print.
- Goffee, Rob and Jones, Gareth. *Why Should Anyone Be Lead By You? What It Takes to Be an Authentic Leader*. Boston: Harvard Business School, 2006. 13, 15. Print.
- Gulick, Luther and Urwick, Lyndall. "Papers on the Science of Public Administration." *Institute of Public Administration*. 1937. New York: Hunger, DJ and Wheelen, 161. Print.
- Gvishianni, Dzhemen Mikhailovich. *Organization and Management: Critique of Western Theories*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972. 35,179. Print.
- Hall, Douglas T. *Careers in and Out of Organizations*. New York: Sage, 2001. 1. Print.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Belknap Harvard University Press, 2009. 85, 87. Print.
- Herzberg, Frederick. *The Motivation to Work*. Boston: Pendant Media Inc., 1991. Print.
- Herzberg, Frederick. *Work and the Nature of Man*. London: Crosby Lockwood Staples., 1974. Print.
- Hillstrom, Laurie. *Workers Unite: The American Labor Movement*. New York: Omnigraphics, 2010. 6. Print.
- Hogg, Michael A. "A Social Identity Theory of Leadership" *Social Psychological Review*. 2001. Vol. 5. 195. Print
- Hyde, Michael J. *The Life Giving Gift of Acknowledgment*. West Lafayette, Purdue UP, 2006. 6. Print.
- Jablin, Frederic M. "Organizational Entry, Assimilation and Exist." *The New Handbook of*

- Organizational Communication*. Eds. F. Jablin and L. Putnum. Newbury: Park, Sage, 2000. Print.
- Jackson, Susan E. *Diversity in the Workplace: Human Resource Initiatives*. New York: The Guilford Press. 1992. Print.
- Jenks, Wilfred J. *The World Beyond the Charter in Historical Perspective: A Tentative Synthesis of Four Stages of World Organization*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969. 11. Print.
- Kalev, Alexandra, Kelly, Erin, and Frank Dobbin. "Best Practices or Best Guesses? Accessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies." *American Sociological Review*. 2006. Vol 71. 589-617.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn Robert. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, 2nd Ed New York: Wiley & Sons, 1978. 3. Print.
- Kramarae, Cherise and Russo, Ann. *The Radical Feminist Movement of the 1850s*. New York: Routledge, 2001. 3, 46, 55, 56. Print.
- Leavitt, Harold J. and Bahrami, Homa. *Managerial Psychology: Managing Behavior in Organizations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. Print.
- Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli. *The Globalization Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2000. 7. Print.
- Lewin, Kurt. "Group decision and social change." In Theodore Newcomb and Eugene Hartley, eds. *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York. Holt, 1985.
- Likert, Rensis. *The Human Organization*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967. 117, Print.
- Likert, Rensis. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1961. Print.

- Martin, Joanne. *Organizational Culture: Mapping the Terrain*. New York: Sage Publications, 2001. 19, 35. Print.
- Marx Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Volume 2*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2001. 43, 268, 534. Print.
- Maslow, Abraham. *Maslow on Management*. New York: Wiley & Sons Inc., 1998. 5, 95. Print.
- Mayo, Elton. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London: Routledge, 1966. Print.
- McGregor, Douglas. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960. Print.
- McIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984. Print.
- Mitroff, Ian. *Crisis Leadership: Planning for the Unthinkable*. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2003. 122. Print.
- Mouzelis, Nicos. *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? Diagnosis and Remedies*, Routledge , 1995. 79. Print.
- Miller, Katherine. *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Processes*. London, Wadsworth, 95. Print.
- Mor Barak, Michalle E. *Managing Diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. London: Sage Publications. 2005. 173, 284. Print.
- Mouzelis, Nicos. *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? Diagnosis and Remedies*. Routledge . 1995. 79. Print.
- Mumby, D. and Putnam, L. "The Politics of Emotion: A Feminist Reading of

- Bounded Rationality” *Academy of Management Review*. 17, 1993. 36, 38.
Print.
- Nadler, Leonard. *Developing Human Resources*. New York: Jossey Bass, 1989. 10, 169, 173, 201, 732. Print.
- Nadler, Leonard. *The Handbook of Human Resource Development*. ed. Zeace Nadler. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1990
- Nelson, Daniel. Scientific Management, Systematic Management, and Labor. 1880-1915. *The Business History Review*. Vol. 48. 4. Boston: The President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1974. 379. 480. 487. 500. Print.
- Ollenburger, Jane C. and Moore, Helen A. *A Sociology of Women: The Intersection of Patriarchy, Capitalism & Colonization*. Englewood Cliffs: Sage Publications, 1992. 203. Print.
- Redding, Charles, W. *Communication within the Organization. An interpretive review of theory and research*. New York: Industrial Communication Council, 1972.
- Rogers, Everett M. and Rekha Agarwala-Rogers. *Communication in Organizations*. New York: The Free Press, 1976. 29. 34. Print.
- Rose, D. *Patterns of American Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1989. Print
- Rosenthal, Robert. “Some Issues in the Replication of Social Science Research.” *Labour Economics*, 1997. Elsevier, vol. 4(2), 123-193. Print.
- Ross, Edward, Alsworth. *Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter- Day Iniquity*. New York: Cornell University Library, 1907. 2009. Print.

- Sauser, William. J. "Encouraging Pluralism in Management Education Programs: An Article from SAM." *Advanced Management Journal*. Society of the Advancement of Management, July 28, 2005. Digital.
- Savage, Mike, and Wietz, Ann. *Gender and Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992. Print.
- Schein, Edgar. H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: John & Sons, 2004. 11, 15, 16, 116, 118, 173, 175, 176, 179. Print.
- Schrag, Calvin O. *Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2003. 72. Print.
- Serrin, William. "In an Epic Time for workers, the labor movement is dying." *The National Catholic Reporter*. July 1, 2010. 75. Digital.
- Shockley-Zalabek, Pamela. *Understanding Organizational Communication: Cases, Commentaries, and Conversations*. New York: Longman Publishing Company, 1994. Print.
- Smircich, Linda and Marta Calas. "Organizational Culture A Critical Assessment" Jablin, F. Putnam. L.K. Roberts and L. Porter eds. *Handbook of Organizational Communication*. New York: Sage Publications, 1987 228-263. Print.
- Snow, Charles C. *Strategy, Organization Design, and Human Resource Management. Strategic Management Policy Planning. Vol. 3*. Jai Press, 1989. Print.
- Stoghill, R.M. *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Practice*. New York: Free Press, 1974. Print.
- Stohl, Cynthia. *Organizational Communication: Connectedness in Action*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995. Print.

- Surma, John. Lecture Course at Duquesne University. Executive Insights. September 8, 2010.
- Sweet, Stephen A. and Meiksins, Peter F. *Changing Contours of Work: Job and Opportunities In the New Economy*. Pine Forge: Pine Forge Press, 2007. Print.
- Taylor, Frederick Winslow. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1923. 5, 6, 12, 31, 36, 37, 137-138, 140. Print.
- Tehrani, Majid. "Islamic Fundamentalism in Iran and the Discourse of Development". *The Globalization Reader*. eds. Frank J. Lechner and John Boli. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2000. 359. Print.
- Vaill, Peter B. F.J. Roethlisberger and the Elusive Phenomena of Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Management Education*. 2007. Vol. 31, 321. Print.
- Von Bertalanffy, Ludwig. *General Systems Theory: Foundations, Development Applications*. New York: George Brazilliar, 1976. 37, 117, 137. Print.
- Warren, Kenneth. *Big Steel: The First Century of the United States Steel Corporation 1901-2001*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001. 7-22. Print.
- Weick, K. E. *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. New York. McGraw-Hill, 1979. 117, Print.
- Whetten, David. "Albert and Whetten Revisited: Strengthening the Concept of Organizational Identity" *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 15, 219, 2006.
- Wren, Daniel A. and Bedeian, Arthur G. *The Evolution of Management Thought*. 6th Ed. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2008. Print.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Work Ethics and The Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Routledge, 1930, 1992. 4, 13, 43. Print.

Weber, Max. *Readings and Commentary on Modernity*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 195. Print.

Wood, Julia T. "Celebrating Diversity in the Communication Field." *Communication Studies*. West Lafayette: Summer. 1998. Vol. 29. Issue 2. 172. Print.

Wood, Julia T. *Gendered Lives: Communicating Gender and Culture*. New York: Wadsworth, 2010. 127, 316, 317. Print.

Yeager, Leland B. *Ethics as Social Science: The Moral Philosophy of Social Cooperation: (New Thinking in Political Economy Series)*. Boston: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2002. 91. 94. Print.